DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 459 UD 012 288

TITLE Technical Reports: Evaluation Reports, ESEA Title I, 1970-1971.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 256p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Compensatory Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; Cultural Enrichment; Culturally Disadvantaged; Educational Disadvantagement; Educational Legislation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Programs; *Elementary School Students; Language Ability; *Language Development; Language Instruction; Mathematics Instruction; *Reading Achievement; Reading Development; Reading Instruction; Reading Level; Reading Skills; *Secondary School Students
IDENTIFIERS Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The activities evaluated in this report were in progress during school year 1970-71, the second of a three-year cycle for ESEA Title I programs in Los Angeles City Schools. The components consisted of instruction (reading, language, and arithmetic), auxiliary services, intergroup relations, parent involvement, and staff development. The performances of both public and nonpublic school pupils were measured, with all pupils meeting or exceeding the Title I objective in reading, and, with the exception of grade 7, all exceeding the objective in arithmetic. Uncertainties of District reorganization affected some auxiliary services, but counseling, pupil services and attendance, and health services continued for all elementary schools in the program and for Student Achievement Center students in the secondary schools. Parent involvement and activities in intergroup relations and staff development had their supportive effects throughout the grades. Appendices contain lists of standardized tests and nonstandardized instruments, as well as a glossary of terminology and personnel titles used in this study. (Author/SB)

ED 062459

LOS ANGELES CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Title 1

Technical Reports

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 012288

Evaluation 1970 - 71

EVALUATION REPORTS
ESEA TITLE I
1970 - 1971

Los Angeles City Unified School District
Measurement and Evaluation Branch
at Emerson Manor

FOREWORD

The activities evaluated in this report were in progress during school year 1970-71, the second of a three-year cycle for ESEA Title I programs in Los Angeles City Schools. The components at work in both elementary and secondary schools were the same: instruction (reading, language, and arithmetic), auxiliary services, intergroup relations, parent involvement, and staff development.

Elementary public school pupils' test results in reading showed that first graders were almost on grade level; that pupils in grades 2 through 6, although still below grade level in achievement, attained a grade equivalent similar to that of last year. Pupils in grades 1, 4, 5, and 6 almost made the Title I objective of achieving one month's gain for one month of instruction.

In arithmetic, pupils in grades 3 to 5 exceeded the Title I objective while pupils in grade 6 almost met the objective. (Pupils in grades 1 and 2 were not tested in arithmetic.)

Elementary nonpublic school pupils met or exceeded the Title I objective in reading; and, with the exception of grade 7, exceeded the objective in arithmetic.

The significant reading and arithmetic gains made in the first year of the saturated program (1969-70) were not easy to duplicate in 1970-71 because of the high achievement base established during the previous year. Results from some schools, however, indicate that successful gains can be achieved by a concentration of resources averaging $300 per pupil over and above resources used in the regular program.

Uncertainties of District reorganization affected some auxiliary services, but counseling, pupil services and attendance, and health services continued for all elementary schools in the program and for Student Achievement Center students in the secondary schools. Parent involvement, and activities in intergroup relations and staff development, had their supportive effects throughout the grades.

Junior high school pupils consistently exceeded their previous year's gains in reading, language, and arithmetic, and uniformly surpassed their non-ESEA school mates. Brown pupils in the secondary Student Achievement Centers recorded significantly improved scores in self-image in comparison with similar scores for the previous year. Notable increases in staff conferences with pupils and parents, and with other staff members, were reported.

With the distribution of this report goes the hope that its data and findings will be used by all staff members concerned with upgrading the learning of Title I pupils.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iii

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COMPONENTS

Instruction 3
Auxiliary Services 27
Intergroup Relations 39
Parent Involvement 47
Staff Development 55
Tables 61

SECONDARY SCHOOL COMPONENTS

Instruction 121
Auxiliary Services 133
Intergroup Relations 141
Parent Involvement 145
Staff Development 149
Tables 155

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENTS

Instruction 207
Supportive Services 219
Tables 233

APPENDIX

List of Standardized Tests 257
List of Nonstandardized Instruments 258
Glossary 260

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COMPONENTS

Title I guidelines state that in school districts which include both elementary and secondary schools, priority should be given to the elementary level. A comprehensive longitudinal program from preschool through grade six has been established to help educationally disadvantaged pupils to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations necessary for achievement.

INSTRUCTION

- Reading
- Mathematics
- English as a Second Language
- Pre-kindergarten
- Kindergarten

AUXILIARY SERVICES

- Counseling
- Health
- Pupil Services and Attendance

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

TABLES

INSTRUCTION

Reading Abstract

Pupils	53,948	
Elementary Schools	55	
Reading Specialists	23	Full time
	13	Half time
Teachers (taught all subjects)	201	
Aides (assisted in all subjects)	275	Full time
	1124	Half time
Approximate Cost	$5,765,736	

DESCRIPTION: Nearly 54,000 elementary school pupils enrolled in the 55 project schools were served by ESEA Title I programs during the 1970-71 school year. With its community advisory council, each school established priorities for allocating resources and planned its reading program. The resulting programs varied from school to school and even from grade to grade within schools.

Two general strategies for program improvement could be identified within project schools. One strategy had a "personnel" approach and the other, a "material-centered" approach. While most schools pursued neither one exclusively, some allocated a major proportion of their resources to either personnel or materials.

The personnel approach employed additional certificated and non-certificated personnel to increase individualized instruction or to provide increased support and service to classroom teachers. Generally speaking, reading teachers and specialists worked directly with pupils, while consultants and resource teachers emphasized services to classroom teachers. Teaching personnel were budgeted, overall, at a ratio of 10 to 1 over consultative personnel. However, schools emphasizing a staff development approach to instructional improvement tended to have a much greater proportion of consultative personnel.

The actual proportions, as they appeared in a survey completed during the last school month, indicated that 60% of all specially funded certificated personnel were classified as "specialists" whose primary function was to work with children in the reading program. Consultants constituted 22% and resource teachers the remaining 18 percent.

The materials-centered approach strived for increased achievement through the concentrated use of a particular set of instructional materials. Reports on materials usage are in preparation.

Nearly 60% of the reading instruction given pupils by specialists was in a separate room, while 38% reported working in the regular classroom with a small group of pupils. In either case while some pupils were with the reading specialist, the classroom teacher had a smaller group with which to work, but not necessarily in reading.

The greatest use of aides was in the primary grades; more than 60% of all pupils in grades one and two received reading instruction in a class which had the service of an aide during that time. The proportion of pupils receiving such assistance during their reading period declined from 57% in the third grade to 52 percent at grade four, and to the low 40's in grades five and six. More than three-quarters of all the Title I pupils received reading instruction from a classroom teacher, not a reading specialist, with or without an aide. The actual amount of instructional time received by a pupil was determined by both his grade level and the number of persons from whom he received reading instruction. Additional details may be found in the Technical Reports, 1970-71. A complete school-by-school analysis of instructional time and instructional system is available on request.

TIME INTERVALS: The project extended over the 1970-71 school year in the same 55 schools as in the preceding year, and it was continued during the summer session.

ACTIVITIES: An analysis of the time and the instructional system indicates that the principal activity was reading instruction taught by a classroom teacher, with or without an aide. Teachers employed a wide range of supplementary materials, a number of instructional methods, and various grouping strategies in their efforts to meet the instructional needs of their pupils. To this end, most schools indicated that they had adopted a "diagnostic-prescriptive" approach. Efforts at implementing that technique varied from use of programmed reading materials with built-in diagnostic and prescriptive measures, to use of diagnostic packages developed elsewhere.

Each zone provided consultation, curricular aid, inservice, and other support to reading consultants and/or specialists at the schools. Additionally, each zone conducted monthly inservice meetings for school personnel; information and training in procedures helped them to fulfill their staff development and inservice roles at their own schools.

OBJECTIVES: The goal of the reading component was
to raise the median achievement level in reading one grade-norm month (0.1) for each month of instruction.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: To evaluate the project in terms of attainment of its objective required standardized testing and interpretation of the test results in months of gain between tests. Standardized tests appropriate to each grade level were administered to all project pupils. With the exception of first grade, every grade had some prior test score on which to base an estimate of reading gains made during the months of instruction between tests.

In grades two and three, the test scores which had been attained the previous May at the conclusion of first and second grades, were used as baseline scores for estimates of gain. The upper grades were tested in October and again in May, providing additional bases for comparisons.

Consistent with requirements of the state mandated testing programs, principals were asked to certify the number of pupils who were exempted from the testing program.

RESULTS: Test scores of pupils in Title I schools, except at third and fourth grades, did not differ more than one month from pupils at the same grade the previous year. Grade three pupils trailed by two months, and grade four pupils trailed by three months, the performance of pupils at those grades in 1969-1970. Allowing for a variation of minus one month from the project objective, that mark was attained by pupils only in grades one, four and six; pupils at grade two failed to reach the objective by -0.7; grade three missed by -0.4; and fifth graders missed by -0.2.

Very large gains by some pupils in 1969-1970 were followed by proportional losses this year. Two-year gains provided a more stable base for comparison of growth and could be observed at grades two, three, five and six on the same test. The median gain for project schools at those grades was in the 0.5 to 0.6 range; this means that these pupils were falling farther behind grade level by three to four months each year. Compared to test norms, Title I pupils lagged behind average reading levels by 7 months at third grade, 1.3 years at fourth grade, and 2.2 years at the 6th grade.

CONCLUSIONS: Title I pupils did about as well in terms of absolute grade level placement in reading this year as last; however, the objective (gain of one month for each month of instruction), was not met at any grade level.

This may be the result, in part, of factors other than the quality of instruction. One such factor was the variation in last year's scores: the great gains reported for some pupils may have artificially raised the pretest scores used as a base from which to measure gains. This effect was particularly apparent in the primary grades. Another cause may have been the negative attitude held by many toward the testing program; this could have had a generally depressing effect on teacher and pupil morale and on the expectations held for pupil performance. Still another possibility lies in the fact that primary grade pupils receiving instruction from nonbasal texts may be progressing towards reading independence in an entirely satisfactory manner but not perform well on the test since the skills required by the test may not correspond with the sequence of skills development on the texts being used. In such cases, judgment about the efficacy of the program must be deferred until the stage of reading independence is reached, usually about the fourth grade.

RECOMMENDATIONS: More definitive conclusions and recommendations await the availability of a better and more consistent program description; this should include an "educational audit" and more detailed information for evaluation, including the ability to follow the progress of a pupil through the grades. This would require a significantly greater commitment to evaluation than is now the case.

Tests are fairest to all when administered under conditions as nearly the same as possible. Trained testing teams could ensure controlled testing conditions and could consistently collect more information than is usually available for detailed evaluation. This would benefit teachers by freeing them of the numerous clerical tasks of evaluation.

The State required practice of pretesting the upper grades should be discontinued; it is expensive and time-consuming, and provides little information additional to that available through use of the previous year's posttest; furthermore, the time required to process results make them of little diagnostic

value to the teacher or the school. Also, the practice encourages "gainsmanship": the theory that posttest scores look better if the pretest scores were not too high.

Recommendations by administrators, teachers, and specialists included: expansion of the program to include more pupils in greater depth; addition of more specialists and norm reduction teachers; paid inservice, and school time provided for inservice; additional teacher aides; more clerical assistance; and a desire for increased flexibility in use of Miller-Unruh reading specialists.

READING

Detailed Report

The data upon which the following report was based are preliminary and subject to some change as errors of various kinds are detected and corrected. Such error is present in all data; it would not likely result in changes of more than (plus or minus) one month in grade equivalent at most locations.

Future analyses will attempt to discover if the relative success or failure of programs is likely to be related to any of the gross instructional variables on which data were collected. Such relationships, if found, should be considered as suggestive only since the instructional data collected were based on estimates and on class averages, not on individual results.

The state mandated program requires testing of elementary school pupils in grades one, two, three, and six with a specific test once a year. Title I guidelines call for administration of pre and post tests, using the same form at both administrations. At grades one, two, and three only one test is required; it was administered in May; for the second and third grades, this test taken the previous May served as the pretest for the current year.

Pupils at grades one and two were administered the Cooperative Primary Reading Test. The Stanford Achievement Test was phased out of the testing program in the third grade. Pupils at grades four, five, and six received the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills in October (November for sixth grade) and again in May.

Achievement scores were reported for two groups of pupils in the upper grades. The first, labelled "All" consisted of all the pupils who took a test at a Title I school. The second group, labelled "Matched" were all those pupils who took both pre and posttests at a Title I school. For a particular school, the matched group of pupils consisted of all pupils who had taken a valid pretest at any Title I school and who had entered the school in which the posttest was taken prior to March 1, 1971; pupils who entered after that date were included only in the total posttest sample for that school; their pretest scores, if any, remained with their former school. Table 2 lists the enrollment, the number and percent of pupils who were tested, and the membership in each group.

Objectives may be interpreted in terms of the portion of a school year between test periods (1.0 ÷ 10 months = 1 month gain per month of instruction). Thus, with eight months between pre and posttesting, a gain of 0.8 meets the objective. Information on the tests used is presented in Table 1.

School by school data are presented (Table 4) for all Title I pupils, and for the group of pupils in the upper three grades who took both pre and posttests (matched).

Although individual school data are published with this report (Table 3 and 4), the discussion focuses on the scores as averaged over all 55 schools. This may conceal some peaks and valleys in the data, but it allows generalizations to be made about the Title I effort as a whole.

Pupils this year did not differ greatly in their grade placements from pupils at the same grade last year, except for third and fourth grade pupils (Table 5). Third grade finished this year two months lower in grade score than last year's third grade, and fourth grade finished three months lower. Grade scores, however, are so inexact that differences of plus or minus one month are negligible.

Since a probable fluctuation of plus or minus one month may be attributed to errors contained within the scores themselves, the objective should be considered as having been attained by pupils at grades four and six, with grade five falling just short. The gap between the measured gain and the objective was seven months at the second grade and four months at third grade.

Relative to average grade level placement as indicated by the 50th percentile in the manuals for the various tests, pupils in the Title I schools fell further behind with each year of school. At second grade the deficit was 7 months, at fourth grade, 1.3 years, and by sixth grade, 2.2 years (Table 1).

In order to interpret the data adequately, it was necessary to differentiate "true" gains from transient or spurious scores which may have resulted from nonstandard conditions before or during the testing. Examination of scores obtained by a group of pupils over periods of time longer than the school year provided evidence of the stability of gains made, and served as indicators of the "true" gains. Such comparisons are most reliable when the same test is repeatedly used throughout the period studied. Same-test comparisons were available at grades two and three, and grades five and six. In each case, gains greater than 1.0 were not maintained in subsequent testings, and the higher the gains were above 1.0, the greater were the losses. This was most visible at second and third grades, where very high grade scores in May 1970 were followed by scores more like those of other pupils of the same grades in May 1971, resulting in apparent "losses" in reading ability over the school year.

The pre-post testing did not reveal the regression effect in the upper grades, but a comparison of grade equivalents in May and October 1971 indicated that gains up to 5.0 years (for the 1970-71 school year) were followed by summer losses as great as 3.9 years. Conversely, pupils who registered the lowest gains during the school year were apt to show continued growth (up to 4 months) over the summer months.

Extension of the same-test comparisons over a two year period provided a more stable base on which to make some judgments about the Title I reading program. For grades two and three the data covered a full two years, from May, 1969 to May, 1971; gains for grades 5 and 6 covered the period from October-November, 1969 to May, 1971. Two-year gains for each school for the above grades are presented (Table 3) with the grade equivalent score attained in May, 1971. Dividing the two-year gain by 2 provided an estimate of the average annual growth rate for a group of pupils.

The 1971 Annual Report on Title I projects from the State Bureau of Compensatory Education Evaluation and Research (page 2) indicated that pupils currently enrolled in Title I programs had, prior to entry into the program, typically attained a growth rate of .5 to .6 per year. Except for the second grade, Title I pupils in Los Angeles equalled or exceeded that rate at every grade level for the past year. For the two year period, however, the grades studied had median annual growth rates of .5 to .6 per year.

Data from the State testing program covering all pupils in the first three grades in the District revealed a two-year growth rate of .7 per year.

Three plans of instruction were implemented for more than 80% of all Title I pupils. A classroom teacher, with or without an aide, taught from 70% of the pupils at grade one to 86% at grade six. A combination of reading specialist and classroom teacher with aide instructed about 14% of the pupils in grades one through four and about 6% of the pupils in grades five and six. A classroom teacher without an aide provided reading instruction for about one-fourth of the pupils in grades one and two, a little more than a third of the pupils in grades three and four, and over half of the fifth and sixth graders.

Pupils instructed by the combination of reading specialist, teacher, and aide, received the longest period of instruction, an average of about 1.7 hours per day. Classroom teachers, with or without aides, averaged 1.4 ho rs of reading instruction per day.

A complete school-by-school analysis by grade, by instructional system, and by time is available on request; ask for "Reports of Reading Instructional Systems." This material is more useful for descriptive purposes than for definitive analyses relative to optimal combinations. Preliminary examination of the data has not revealed any relationships between reading achievement and instructional place or time.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: In addition to the achievement data which forms the core of the evaluation, project personnel were asked to contribute their first-hand observations of the reading program. While teacher, specialists, and administrators differed slighcly in emphasis, there was general agreement that the project was beneficial to pupils, and many of the responses were enthusiastic.

Among the strengths mentioned generally were the following:

Pupil improvement and involvement
Teacher and specialist teamwork, including team teaching
Availability of reading specialist and other additional personnel
Abundance of materials
Increased individualization of instruction
Libraries and librarians
Lowered class norms

A number of respondents listed "no weaknesses" for the program; others mentioned the following weaknesses.

Lack of time for clerical duties, planning, conferencing with classroom teachers, inservice training
Inadequate definition of specialist function and responsibilities
Unsatisfactory criteria for selection of pupils for reading specialists
Rigidity of Miller-Unruh reading program
Shortage of space for small-group instruction and materials storage
Insufficient clerical assistance
Late delivery of materials

Need for coordination and cooperation between specialists and teachers
Inability to obtain qualified teachers as replacements for outstanding teachers who become specialists and consultants
Inadequate diagnostic materials
Overscheduling of specialists

Recommendations generally reflected comments about strengths and weaknesses. Among the more frequent were:

Continue and expand the program to include more pupils in greater depth
Employ more specialists and norm reduction teachers
Develop consistent criteria for selection of pupils for reading specialists
Have specialist and classroom teacher, rather than classroom teacher alone, select remedial pupils.
Provide more inservice training and make it available on school time
Supply more teacher aide services
Provide additional clerical assistance
Increase opportunities for cooperative planning by specialists and classroom teachers

In conclusion, there is no real evidence that we actually know how to teach educationally disadvantaged pupils to read in any consistently successful manner. Evaluation data are gathered at too remote a level to allow for definitive statements about specific instructional programs. The inability to track individual pupils through the grades limits the ability to make statements about long-range program effects. The probable noncorrespondence of phonic-linguistic instructional methods with primary grade tests may be a disadvantage to pupils using those materials until they reach the stage of reading independence, usually about the 4th grade. Poor scores on standardized achievement tests and misuse of those scores have created negative attitudes on the part of professional personnel toward testing per se, and may well be responsible for some of the aberrant test scores observed.

The evidence that Title I programs have been able to reverse the poor achievement cycle which had typified the reading performance of educationally disadvantaged pupils is largely lacking. The degree to which such programs have actually benefited pupils is a matter of speculation.

Mathematics Abstract

Pupils	53,948
Elementary Schools	55
Mathematics Specialists	13
Teachers (taught all subjects)	201
Aides - Assisted in all subjects (full time	275
Aides - Assisted in all subjects (part time	1,124
Approximate Cost	$3,377,669

DESCRIPTION: In the mathematics component each school was encouraged to develop innovative approaches which would best meet the needs of its pupils. The following information, therefore, serves as a generalized description of the program without specific reference to the variations within the 55 participating ESEA schools.

The component served almost 54,000 pupils in kindergarten through grade six. Each school had the services of a special mathematics teacher whose duties varied from working almost full time with pupils to serving only teachers. This person was called "consultant," "specialist," "math resource teacher," or "math teacher" in the various schools.

Specialists in music, art, and physical education incorporated mathematics concepts and skills in their respective subject areas and helped regular teachers to individualize instruction by lowering class size. Also, education aides assisted teachers in most schools. Thirteen full-time math specialists served the mathematics component.

In some schools math teachers used the "pull-out" method to teach pupils in greatest need of help while the regular teacher worked with the remainder of the class. In others they engaged in team-teaching or taught demonstration lessons, some daily, some twice weekly. In a few schools certain teachers departmentalized mathematics and reading instruction with their two classes; one teacher instructed both classes in mathematics, the other taught reading.

TIME INTERVALS: The component operated from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971, and was continued for some pupils during the summer sessions.

ACTIVITIES: Instruction was provided on an individual basis and in small groups. Diagnostic tests, materials from the Madison Mathematics Project, programmed workbooks, basic and supplemental textbooks, and teacher-made learning materials were utilized. Concrete and manipulative materials such as abaci, Cuisenaire rods, and geoboards were used in independent activities. Pupils learned basic mathematics facts, measurement principles, problem solving, money and time concepts, and discovery methods. Compared with last year, a larger number of math labs and a greater amount of mathematics supplies and equipment were available for use by pupils and teachers.

Grade-level meetings, workshops, and inservice classes were scheduled regularly throughout the year to develop instructional materials, strengthen teaching skills, and increase effectiveness in the use of curriculum materials. Zone consultants assisted teachers in experimenting with new techniques and in interpreting test data. Monthly inservice meetings were conducted by zone mathematics consultants for school personnel specializing in mathematics. Services of mathematics education experts from outside the District were frequently utilized at these meetings.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the component were

- to improve classroom performance in other skill areas (mathematics) beyond usual expectations.
- to raise the median gain of project participants in mathematics by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Pre and posttests were used to measure achievement in mathematics of all pupils in grades three through six in the target schools. Third graders took the Cooperative Primary Test, while fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade pupils were tested with the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Special mathematics teachers and administrators rated various aspects of the program.

RESULTS: For the Title I schools as a group, the math component exceeded its objective of one year's growth in one year's time for three of the four grades tested. The sixth grade almost met the objective (six months' progress during seven months' instruction).

The greatest gain occurred in the third and fourth grades, both exceeding the objective by approximately 25% (ten months' progress during eight months of instruction). The fifth grade also exceeded the objective, but to a lesser degree (about 13%).

It should be noted, however, that even though project objectives were exceeded in three of the four grades and nearly met for the sixth grade, decrements from median grade placement ranged from just less than one year for the third grade to nearly two years for the sixth grade.

Analysis of gains covering a two-year period, 1969-71, indicated that current fifth and sixth graders achieved or exceeded the general objective in 28% of the schools (14 of 50).

While analysis indicated no significant differences in progress between the 1969-70 and 1970-71 school years, decrements from normal grade level equivalency increased in 1970-71 by 4 months in grade four and 1 month in grade five; the decrement in grades three and six remained unchanged.

CONCLUSIONS: Title I pupils exceeded the stated objective for grades three, four, and five, and almost achieved the objective for grade six. Decrements from grade levels based on national norms were slightly increased for two of the four grades.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The math component should be continued. Where priorities permit, the teacher-pupil ratio should be reduced in an effort to decrease the pupils' decrements from national norm grade levels.

MATHEMATICS

Detailed Report

Attainment of component objectives was evaluated according to pupil scores on the Cooperative Primary Mathematics test (third grade) and on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (fourth through sixth grades) and according to open-end comments by administrators and mathematics consultants in the schools. The two tests were completed by pupils at the beginning and again at the end of the school year. Administrators and consultants evaluated the program during the spring semester.

Results showed that the objective was met or exceeded for grades 3, 4, and 5, when matched scores were used as criteria. Grade 6 almost met the objective, gaining six months in grade equivalency during seven months of instruction.

All but one grade gained one month or more for each month of instruction; however, each grade again remained, as it did last year, well below the national norm grade level placement; i.e., third grade, -0.9; fourth grade, -1.3; fifth grade, -1.5; sixth grade, -1.8. These decrements are based on matched median scores.

The results of the pre and posttests in terms of grade equivalents based on matched scores, are shown for each school by grades in Table 6 ; a Summary of all ESEA schools by grades is the last item of the table.

Table 7 presents a two-year study (October '69 through May '70) for three groups of pupils. Pupils in group "A" gained 1.7 years during the two-year period (17 school months of instruction) while those in groups "B" and "C" gained 1.6 years during the same period. All grade equivalents are based on matched median scores.

Table 8 indicates that decrements from normal grade level equivalency have increased from last school year to this year by .3 year, .2 year, and by .1 year for the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades, respectively. The decrement in grade 3 did not change.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Open-end questionnaires on the effectiveness of the program were completed by SFP mathematics consultants or specialists in the schools. Deficiencies in the program on which they commented included: schools have too few math consultants -- they should be proportional to the enrollment (15 mentions); additional supplemental materials and equipment are needed for math labs or classrooms (8); more inservice education is needed for classroom teachers instructing in math (7); assignments unrelated to math, such as yard duty or substitution for another teacher, should not be made to math consultants (5); more space should be allocated to the program (4); administrators should define more exactly the duties of math consultants (4); scheduling of "pull-out" of pupils for math instruction is ineffective (4); and math labs should be available for more pupil hours (4).

Comments attributed the effectiveness of the program in part to: scheduling of small groups of pupils to work with the consultant (9); team teaching approach (5); freedom given to consultants to innovate (4); organization and

content of inservice education for teachers (4); exposure of pupils to the techniques of several mathematics instructors, i.e., the consultant and one or more mathematics teachers (4).

When asked to comment on the SFP math program, administrators tended to agree with math consultants as to needs. Eight suggestions were received that more math consultants be assigned to the schools, and eight other recommendations were for more math inservice education for teachers. Administrators were not as specific in listing strengths of the program as were math consultants. Many comments were in general terms, such as: "the total math program underwent significant educational growth and change"; "the students have made progressive improvement"; "gives much help to individual teachers"; and "recommends early diagnosis and prescriptive methods". At least eight administrators attributed success in the program to the additional materials purchased with program funds.

English as a Second Language Abstract

Pupils	2047
Elementary Schools	23
Teachers	38
Aides	--
Approximate Cost	$307,050

DESCRIPTION: The English as a Second Language (ESL) component served pupils who were unable to speak English, or were having difficulty in speaking English, because of primary use of another language, usually Spanish, in the home.

The classes, from kindergarten through sixth grade, ranged in size from nine to eighteen pupils. Most pupils were initially identified and recommended for this component by their classroom teachers. Referrals were made by principals, parents, and ESL teachers. The ESL teachers screened pupils by means of oral interviews and diagnostic tests to determine their proficiency in English.

TIME INTERVALS: The component was in operation from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971. Instruction periods ranged from 30 minutes to one hour, to half-day self-contained, to full-day self-contained.

ACTIVITIES: The audio-lingual approach was emphasized in the program. Language development focused on interests and experiences that were familiar to the pupils in their native language.

Teachers provided opportunities for reading as soon as basic sentence patterns had been mastered. Pupils next learned to write, using materials from the ESL reading program and examples from their own conversation.

Before classes began, the coordinator and consultant planned and conducted two days of preservice for new ESL teachers. Subject matter included the problems and needs of non-English-speaking children, linguistics, second-language teaching techniques and procedures, an audio-visual materials workshop, and materials evaluation.

During the year the coordinator and consultant held two-and-one-half hour inservice meetings each month. Subject areas which had been introduced during the preservice meetings were expanded and discussed in greater depth, drawing increased relevance from the participants' actual ESL teaching experiences.

OBJECTIVES: The goal of this program was
to improve the verbal functioning level (English) of the children.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: ESL pupils in the 23 ESEA schools and pupils in seven comparison schools were given, pre and post, the ESL/Bilingual Structured

Placement Test. The comparison pupils spoke little or no English but were not in the ESL classes.

RESULTS: The adjusted mean score of the ESEA group on the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test was significantly higher than the adjusted mean score of the comparison group.

Parents responded favorably to the component and recommended that it be continued.

Classroom teachers, ESL teachers, and administrators reported that the component had improved the pupils' verbal proficiency in English, their attitudes, and their academic skills.

An inservice education program provided training and development of skills that would aid in attainment of the objective. Teacher participants reported the inservice program as successful. When asked to rate inservice content in terms of "expectation" and "fulfillment," teachers indicated that only one of the seven inservice items exceeded their expectations.

CONCLUSIONS: Pupil scores on the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test indicated that the objective to improve the verbal functioning level of the children was attained.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The component should be continued and expanded.

Again, as indicated in the 1969-70 evaluation, the number of ESL teachers should be increased; self-contained classrooms should be used; periods of instruction should be lengthened; and coordination of activities between ESL and regular classroom teachers should be improved.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Detailed Report

Attainment of objectives in the English as a Second Language (ESL) component was evaluated by pupil scores on the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test, analysis of staff comments and recommendations, and analysis of parent reponses to a questionnaire.

Levels I and II[1] of the ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test, were administered (pre) in September 1970, and (post) in May 1971 to ESL students and a comparison group. The comparison group was composed of pupils who would have qualified for ESL instruction if funding had made it possible to include their schools in the program.

Parent responses to a questionnaire, and ratings and comments by regular classroom teachers, ESL teachers, and administrators were obtained shortly after midyear.

The ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test, consisting of Level I, Parts 1 and 2, and Level II, has a maximum raw score of 100. The test measured pupils' ability to produce basic linguistic structures in sentence patterns.

The ESEA Title I group had higher pre, post, and adjusted mean scores than did their comparison group (Table 9). The F ratio on the adjusted means of the test was significant at the .01 level in favor of the ESEA group.

Parent responses (Table 10) indicates that only 20 percent of the parents spoke English at home; 97% of the parents thought their children's English had improved; 87% of the parents had received information about the program; and 97% of the parents wanted the program to continue. However, only 48% of the parents said they had visited an ESL classroom.

Teacher ratings (Table 11) show that the pupils improved in pronunciation skills, speech patterns, vocabulary, learning skills, and attitude toward speaking English. These teachers felt that pupil selection was appropriate and that pupils increased their use of English in informal situations. Most teachers had sent two-to-four of their pupils to the ESL class.

The majority of the 22 administrators and 26 ESL teachers who responded to an open-end questionnaire, felt that the ESL program was a strong one.

An inservice program was conducted to assist participating teachers in fulfillment of the objective. Teachers rated the inservice education on a questionnaire which asked them to rate their "expectations" before the beginning of each meeting and their "fulfillment" at the close. Generally, both "expectations" and "fulfillment" ranged from 3.4 to 4.2 medians on a 1-5, Very Low-Very High scale. Of the seven areas rated, only one — audio-visual aids — exceeded their expectations.

---

[1]The District had reproduced Level I of the test by permission, but Level II was purchased. Both levels will be purchased next year as the tests are now copyrighted and commercially produced.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: The component attained its objective of improving the verbal functioning level (English) of the children.

Parents responded positively to the component and wanted it continued. Although 80% of the parents were not speaking English at home with the child, only 21% were taking adult school courses in English.

Of the 255 regular classroom teachers who responded to a questionnaire, 118 made specific comments. They stressed the need of longer and more frequent periods of instruction (34 mentions); improvement of the pull-out system (13); use of the self-contained classroom for at least a half-day (9); need for more ESL teachers (23); coordination of activities between themselves and the ESL teacher (14); and additional planning time to make the program more effective (20).

Twenty-six ESL specialists, responding to an open-end questionnaire, concurred that there was a need for more ESL teachers. According to their responses, weaknesses in the program included a lack of materials and equipment, and the brevity of instructional periods. The specialists recommended that guidelines be furnished to structure the program as to class size, length and number of periods, time of day to schedule classes, and inservice.

Generally, the administrators reported that teachers were doing an outstanding job. Ten of them stressed a need for a greater number of experienced ESL teachers and more ESL classrooms.

Pre-Kindergarten Abstract

Pupils	1005
Schools	38
Teachers	67
Aides	67
Approximate Cost	$1,311,000

DESCRIPTION: The pre-kindergarten program was designed to help meet the children's individual needs, to improve their self-image, and to assist them in achieving greater success in school. To accomplish this goal, this year's program increased the emphasis on developing academic readiness.

Classes consisted of a maximum of 15 children who would be of kindergarten age in the following year. Criteria used for selection included such factors as family circumstances, housing, economic status, and cutural background including extent of bilingual usage.

A diagnostic-prescriptive approach was utilized in the 67 classes involved. In each class of 15 children a teacher and an education aide planned indoor and outdoor activities to aid the individual child in developing perceptual and motor skills, appropriate social-emotional behavior, and readiness for successful academic performance.

In addition to full-time teachers, consultants, and the coordinator-specialist, part-time counselors and health services personnel also assisted in the component.

TIME INTERVALS: The component operated from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971. Daily classes were held for three hours either in the morning or afternoon. Teachers made home visits four days a week.

ACTIVITIES: Children's experiences included observing plants and animals and caring for them; participating in dramatic representations, particularly in the playhouse center; manipulating puzzles, blocks, and puppets; using toy telephones, wheel toys, and playground equipment; singing and listening to music; exploring art media; viewing films; and engaging in walking trips into the community. The children were able to explore and enjoy such activities individually, in small groups, and as members of an entire class. Instructional media included visual aids to help in learning to distinguish shapes; record players for use by children with listening difficulties; tape recorders to remediate speech difficulties; matching pictures for language development; and games designed to teach number concepts.

Pre-kindergarten children received physical examinations. (See Health Services abstract.)

In morning or afternoon, when they were not involved in class work, teachers made home visits, engaged in individual pupil and parent conferences, maintained records, acquired supplies and materials, and attended monthly inservice meetings.

Parents and community volunteers participated in this program on a rotating basis, with parent meetings held monthly in the several schools. Frequent staff conferences were held with teachers and supportive staff members.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the pre-kindergarten component were
to improve the verbal functioning level of the children.
to improve the nonverbal functioning level of the children.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: The Bettye Caldwell Preschool Inventory was administered to each child in October 1970 (pretest) and in May 1971 (posttest). Parents, teachers, and administrators rated various aspects of the program, and teachers evaluated their education aides.

RESULTS: Data from the Caldwell Preschool Inventory indicated that children enrolled in morning classes did significantly better than those in afternoon classes. Component children achieved significantly more than did either the local control group or the comparable norm group, but older children did not perform significantly better than younger children except on the two concept activation subtests.

Responses to parent and administrator questionnaires showed that both groups regard the program highly. Although only a few administrators listed program weaknesses, pre-kindergarten teachers mentioned lack of parent participation and lack of space as two main problems. Teachers again, as in 1969-70, rated their aides at near maximum on all items.

CONCLUSIONS: Based on Caldwell Preschool Inventory results, it appears to be inconclusive as to whether morning or afternoon classes do better (since 1969-70 and 1970-71 results were in contrast). A comparison of component children with control and norm groups strongly indicates the success of the program, as do responses to questionnaires from parents, teachers, and administrators.

RECOMMENDATION: The component should be continued.

PRE-KINDERGARTEN

Detailed Report

Attainment of component objectives was evaluated according to pupil scores on the Bettye Caldwell Preschool Inventory; open-end comments by administrators, teachers, and consultants; and questionnaire response by parents. The Preschool Inventory was completed by pupils at the beginning and again at the end of the school year; parents and school employees evaluated the program at the end of the year.

Tables 12 through 18 summarize the results of the Caldwell Preschool Inventory, administered to one randomly selected class in each of 32 schools participating in the component. The test was not administered to pre-kindergarten pupils in six other component schools used for control purposes.

Table 12 shows a comparison of achievement of morning and afternoon classes, and, in contrast to 1969-70 findings, indicates that children in morning classes achieved significantly more than did those in afternoon classes.

Table 13 compares the achievement of children whose parents visited the class to a greater extent with that of children whose parents visited less. Based on monthly reports from teachers which reflected both the number of parents (or guardians) visiting each day and the duration of their visits, a total number of parent-hours was obtained for each class. Pre-post scores of children in 16 classes that had greater parent visitation (88 to 286 parent-hours average per month) were compared with scores of children in the 16 classes that had less parent visitation (15 to 82 parent-hours average per month). No significant differences in pre-post scores were found between the two groups.

Table 14 compares achievement of ESEA Title I children with that of children waiting for admittance to the program in the six component schools in which ESEA Title I children were not tested. The waiting-list children were not enrolled in any preschool program between pre- and posttesting. As might be expected, differences were significant in favor of the ESEA Title I group both on the total test and on all subtests.

Table 15 contrasts the pre-post scores of children 52-58 months of age at the time of the posttest with those 59-65 months of age at the time of the posttest. Two subtests show significant differences in favor of older children (concept activation, both numerical and sensory).

Table 16 presents a listing of comparisons of the mean pre-post scores of the randomly selected class in each school with the mean pre-post scores of all other selected classes combined. Table 17 shows the same data in rank order of significance of differences between each selected class and all other selected classes. Six classes each performed significantly above, and six others significantly below the average of the other 31 classes.

Comparisons for the total test and for each subtest between the selected ESEA Title I classes and a similar norm group are detailed in Table 18. The norm group, described in Caldwell Preschool Inventory literature, was similar to the control group for which data were presented in Table 14 in that no instruction was involved prior to test administration. Scores of children 43-48 months of

age at the time of the pretest were compared with those of children 55-60 months of age at the time of the posttest for both the ESEA Title I and norm groups. However, the norm-group children (43-48 months old) whose pretest scores are presented are not the same children (55-60 months old) whose posttest scores are presented. Again, as in Table 14, local ESEA Title I children did significantly better on the total test and on all subtests. Mean scores of ESEA Title I children listed in Table 18 are not the same as those of Title I children listed in Table 14 because of the increased age limitations (Table 18) necessary for comparison with the norm group.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: In 1970-71, 51% of parents responded to questionnaires, compared to 53% in 1969-70. Of those who gave reasons for not visiting (or seldom visiting) the program, 15% fewer gave "taking care of younger children" as a reason than did the 1969-70 parents; 17% more stayed away for "some other reason." Again, parents were overwhelmingly favorable toward the program, indicating that the program benefitted their children and that they wished the program to be continued.

SFP pre-kindergarten teachers were also asked to evaluate the program, listing strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. Some of the strengths reported, in order of frequency of response, were: parent involvement (24); program superior to others in helping children to develop (15); small size of classes (12); help that the program gives pupils to develop good attitudes (12). Two principal weaknesses were thought to be insufficient parental support (9 responses) and inadequate space for the program (6). Recommendations by pre-kindergarten teachers included expansion of the program through additional classes (11 mentions); more parent participation (5); full-time aides (5); larger supply allotment (4); and a more structured curriculum (4).

Table 19 compares 1969-70 with 1970-71 ratings of aides by teachers; it shows few differences. However, 91% of teachers responded to the questionnaire in 1970-71 as compared with only 77% in 1969-70. On a 1-5, minimum-maximum scale, 4 of 10 items had a median rating of 4.9 in 1970-71. Median ratings for all items were 4.6 or above.

When asked to list program strengths, many administrators simply expressed general endorsement of the program. Some typical comments were: "still one of the best of Title I components"; "children showed increased readiness for school over those not having experience"; "this program is highly successful...we have a waiting list and could use several more classes."

Weaknesses listed by administrators were: more equipment needed (2 responses); space inadequate (2); lack of parent participation (2); vandalism a problem (1); three-hour sessions too long (1); food preparation facilities inadequate (1); more inservice education needed for teachers (1); program should be bilingual (1).

Kindergarten Abstract

Pupils	875
Elementary Schools	6
Teachers - Title I	2
Consultants - Title I	4
Teachers - District	33
Approximate Cost	$72,000

DESCRIPTION: The kindergarten component operated under two plans: 1) in each of two schools a funded teacher taught a class of her own (one of these teachers was replaced at mid term); and 2) in each of four other schools, a funded consultant worked with District teachers and their classes.

The total program served 35 classes of 25 pupils each; two classes were taught by funded teachers, and 33 classes were taught by District teachers working with four funded consultants.

TIME INTERVALS: Classes were held for three hours daily (½ hour longer than the preceding year) in either morning or afternoon from mid-September, 1970 to mid-June, 1971. Each teacher was assigned to one class per day.

ACTIVITIES: Activities were similar to those in regular District classes. Classes reported the use of the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SRL) First Year Communications Program, Behavioral Research Laboratory (BRL) Sullivan Programmed Readers, Ginn Language Kits, Harper and Row Basic Reading Program, Science Research Associates (SRA) Distar Reading System, and Bank Street Readers.

All teachers had the services of education aides and all attended District inservice meetings.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the kindergarten project were
- to improve the verbal functioning level of the children.
- to increase the childrens' expectations of success in school. (Project participants will score on posttest at or above the national median score for entering first graders on the Metropolitan Readiness Test.)

EVALUATION STRATEGY: The Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT) (Form B) was administered pre, October 1970, and post, May 1971, to pupils in 12 ESEA classes and in 12 comparison classes in both ESEA and non-ESEA schools; three schools in the consultant model were not pretested because project participation was not reported in time. Teachers and administrators answered questionnaires on the effectiveness of the component.

RESULTS: The total experimental group attained the national average percentile, but the funded-teacher model did not. The total group surpassed only one of the three local comparison groups. Differences in gains between experimental models were not significant, and all posttest scores were in the publisher's average range.

Children with prior school experience attained the highest post score. Groups who took both pre- and posttest made higher scores than did groups taking only pre or only post.

CONCLUSIONS: The component as a whole fulfilled its objectives, but the funded-teacher model performed below expectation, as based on last year's results. Differences may have been due to teacher or school effects. Children with preschool experience appeared to outperform those without it. Because they were not isolated for analysis, the effects of such variables as instructional time, class size norm, number of classes per teacher, and materials used are inconclusive.

Stability of residence and attendance may be a factor in school performance. It may be unrealistic to expect highly transient children to attain the national median score. The kindergarten component seemed to have little direction, supervision, or communication. There was apparently no provision for different treatment or materials in experimental classes.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The present emphasis on early childhood education indicates that the kindergarten level is potentially of the greatest importance and should be receiving a great deal of attention. However, since there is little evidence that the component as now constituted differs from the regular District program, it should be discontinued.

Evaluation of kindergarten programs should continue. Some effort should be made to isolate and study variables which may affect performance results.

KINDERGARTEN

Detailed Report

Standardized test scores, staff ratings, and comments served as indicators in evaluating the attainment of component objectives.

The Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT), Form B, was administered to ESEA Title I children and to a comparison group in October, 1970 (pre) and in May, 1971 (post). Because of organizational changes, shifts in funding, and lack of uniformity in reporting procedures, three schools were posttested only. The experimental component consisted of two models: model A consisted of funded teachers with their own classes; and model B, of funded consultants working with District teachers. Three local comparison groups were used. The First Comparison Group consisted of residual classes in model A; the Second Comparison Group was comprised of classes in target schools; and the Third Comparison Group contained classes in comparable nontarget schools.

Table 20 compares the performance of pupils in the two experimental models. Although both groups scored in the publisher's "average" range, and differences in gains were not significant, model A scored below the national median for entering first graders; model B exceeded it. In contrast to results of the preceding school year, model B made higher numerical scores than did model A.

Tables 21 and 22 show test results of groups according to their preschool experience. The Head Start group made the highest post mean total score and the highest in three subtests. The no-experience group made the lowest post total scores and the lowest in all subtests except Word Meaning. (Last year's Head Start showed the greatest gain but had not caught up with pre-kindergarten at the time of the posttest.)

The total experimental group surpassed only the inschool comparison classes as indicated by the adjusted means (Table 23). These classes were from two schools which ranked 25th and 29th among 29 city target schools reporting; their experimental classes did not attain the national median.

It was not possible to isolate for analysis the variables of instructional time, materials, number of classes per teacher, or class size norm. Instructional time was increased thirty minutes daily over the prior year, and all teachers had only one class instead of two; the class-size norm increased from 21.6 to 24.4. The post mean of the experimental group dropped from 59.34 in 1969-70 to 56.22 in 1970-71.

Table 24 compares the scores of three groups of children; Group I took both pre- and posttest; Group II, pretest only; Group III took posttest only. Group I attained significantly higher scores at the .001 level than did the other two groups.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Five of six specially-funded personnel completed questionnaires on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. They listed as strengths, resource persons (3 responses), education aides (2), and availability of materials (2). They mentioned weaknesses in the following frequencies: need for inservice in instructional skills (3), need for guidelines (2), and need for smaller classes (2).

Forty-seven of 55 teachers rated the services of the education aides whom they shared. Ratings ranged from 4.0 to 4.8 on a 1-5, Negative-Positive scale (Table 25). Ratings on the same items were slightly lower than those of the preceding year. Twenty-five of 30 teachers wrote favorable comments and recommended one aide per class (8 responses), paid workshops for aides (8), and no aides with serious personal or health problems (4).

AUXILIARY SERVICES

Counseling Abstract

Pupils	7200
Elementary Schools (Public)	55
Nonpublic Schools	32
Counselors	35
Approximate Cost	$576,595

DESCRIPTION: The counseling component is an ongoing program designed to provide services to target schools within and outside the District. Of the 35 counselors added by the component, 25 served the District's 55 ESEA Title I elementary schools, seven supported nonpublic schools with Title I programs, two helped the Follow-Through Program and one functioned as a counselor-consultant to Prekindergarten teachers. Among the 55 schools with saturated compensatory programs, six chose not to spend funds for extra counseling services. The other 49 schools varied widely in the amount of extra counseling they utilized, ranging from a counselor one day per month to two full-time counselors.

TIME INTERVALS: Counselors began their assignments seven days before the opening of school in September, 1970, and continued three days past the close of school in June, 1971. The counseling specialist who coordinated the program served 11 months.

ACTIVITIES: Counselors engaged in a wide variety of counseling and psychological services; type of service offered depended upon the needs of the schools, the training and skills of the individual counselors, and the limits of time and school facilities. They counseled with children and parents individually and in groups; made individual psychological studies of pupils with learning and/or behavior problems, including educational diagnosis and teaching recommendations; helped clarify information on mental hygiene and child development for parents and teachers; and assisted school staff members in the interpretation of test data. Counselors also worked with community groups, service agencies and the School Advisory Committees.

The Title I counseling specialist assisted in District inservice workshop designed to help counselors in the following areas: assessing the "in-between" pupil; helping pupils with language handicaps; brainstorming for innovative practices; the counselor and the community; behavior modification; the opportunity room; group counseling action and interaction; the challenge of reorganization; planning for K-12 zone counselor role; and the "un-session." Each counselor attended his choice of four workshops. Invited guests from universities and neighboring school districts, and qualified members of District and Title I programs served as leaders. Title I counselors also attended two other Districtwide inservice meetings and monthly zone meetings. New counselors received approximately 40 hours of inservice training from the District counseling staff and the Title I counseling specialist.

OBJECTIVE: The goal of the counseling component was to identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Records of counselor activities, including the number of pupils served, were tabulated. Ratings by teachers and counselors, and comments of program effectiveness by teachers, counselors, and principals were tabulated, categorized, and analyzed.

RESULTS: Teachers (601) assigned average median ratings to their schools' counseling services for helping them to work with pupil learning, behavior, and self-concept problems. Teachers (212) who had five or more pupils seen by a counselor rated these services slightly above average. Teachers (81) who had no children contacted rated the program below average.

Counselors' ratings indicated that they performed most effectively when working individually with pupils, teachers, and parents.

District records of counselor services showed a decrease from the previous year in testing activities and an increase in supplementary counseling of pupils, teachers, and parents.

CONCLUSIONS: The counseling component fulfilled its objective of identifying pupils' specific assets and limitations related to the learning process. Teacher reactions to counseling services differed widely. Counselors and administrators felt that the component was effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Establish more counselor positions to reduce the pupil to counselor ratio. Performance objectives for counseling services should be developed.

Counselors should work with principals and teachers at each school to explain counseling activities, establish school priorities, and clarify procedures for the staff.

Closer teacher-counselor teamwork should be maintained to assist children who have learning and behavior problems. More counselor time, inservice training, and District planning should be directed toward this goal.

COUNSELING

Detailed Report

The component was assessed by ratings and comments of teachers, counselors, and administrators and by analysis of central office records of counseling and psychological services to pupils.

Counseling and psychological services, an ongoing component, provided similar services to those offered in 1969-70. Tables 26 and 27 , based on Counselor Reports of Individual Studies (Form 27.74), record the numbers and grade distribution of pupils referred to counselors for individual examination. More than 4000 pupils were studied, a net reduction of 20% from last year's totals. Counselor supplementary reports show that 3761 Title I pupils were counseled as compared to 2911 for 1969-70; this is a 23% increase in counseling activities. These reports indicated a trend away from individual testing and toward more individual counseling for the 1970-71 school year.

Of the pupils referrals in Title I schools, 34% were for psychological reevaluation, 18% to obtain additional data, 14% for superior achievement, 14% for MR evaluation, and 13% for academic retardation. Sixty percent of all pupils referred were boys.

Table 28 reports the numbers and types of evaluative and diagnostic tests used by counselors. The Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler scales were the standard individual tests for measures of ability. This was the first year that the number of Wechslers administered outnumbered the Binets. The Leiter International, a non-verbal test, was frequently used with non-English speaking children. Among other evaluative devices employed by counselors, the Wide Range Achievement Test continued to be the most frequent measure of individual academic achievement. The Draw a Person and the Binder Visual-Motor Gestalt tests remained prominent as semi-projective assessments of emotional and physiological maturity.

Analysis of counselor recommendations and plans for pupils (Table 29) reveals that placement in the regular classroom with a specified program of remedial help was the most frequent recommendation (55%). Thirty percent of the placement recommendations were for assignment to EMR classes.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Teacher assessments of counseling and psychological services were obtained by questionnaire in May, 1971. Of 1350 questionnaires distributed, 883 (65%) were returned. A total of 682 teachers completed ratings of services, and 481 teachers contributed multiple comments. Twelve percent of the sample responding (81 teachers) reported that none of their pupils had been seen by a counselor, 57% (385 teachers) indicated from one to four pupils had been counseled, and 31% (212 teachers) said that five or more pupils had received counselor services.

Teachers rated the effectiveness of the component on help received in working with pupils to solve learning problems, to cope with behavior problems, and to develop positive pupil self-concepts (Table 30). Median ratings for the entire sample of teachers were average on all three items; they were average also among

teachers who had one to four pupils counseled. Teachers who had no children seen by a counselor, rated the items below average, whereas those who had five or more pupils counseled, rated the services slightly above average.

Teachers considered testing (187 comments), counseling and conferencing (170), pupil placement and follow-up (37), assistance to disturbed children (16), and help to develop pupil's self-concept (11), to be the most helpful of the counseling services. Least helpful services were less specifically identified. Little help (40 comments), not enough services (27), and need for more assistance with learning and behavior problems (26) were the most frequent of 105 comments.

Asked what counselors could provide, teachers responded with a variety of suggestions most of which asked for more help to children and teachers: specific help to classroom teachers (109 comments), more individual and group counseling (91), more counselor time in the school (48), more and faster service (28), teacher and teacher-parent conferences (21), more testing (21), observation of children (13), case follow-up (10), and less testing (9).

Administrators, responding to open-end items, commented on program strengths and weaknesses. Positive comments outnumbered negative about three to one. Representative comments were:

> A great number of children benefit from group counseling, individual counseling and screening for proper grade placement. Counselors are available to follow through with recommendations and prescriptions. Counseling builds positive self-image in students who relate their problems, either personal or academic.
>
> Three days of counseling time enabled identification of more EMR and gifted pupils.
>
> More time should be devoted to individual and group counseling on a continual basis.
>
> We no longer have long waiting lists of children needing the counselor's attention.
>
> Counselor is able to spend more time counseling teachers, parents, and pupils.
>
> The limited success of the counseling component was partially due to lack of sufficient time. The numerous requests for individual testing left no time for true counseling.
>
> The new EMR program, which includes testing EMR pupils annually, consumes much of the counselor's time. This means less time for group counseling and identification of individual pupils problems.

Thirty-four Title I counselors returned questionnaires rating their services on ten criteria (Table 31). Individual diagnostic studies, individual conferences with teachers and parents, and individual counseling with pupils received the highest median ratings. The overall program was rated effective.

Asked to mention their most useful services, 31 counselors responded: individual counseling (13 comments), individual diagnostic studies and teacher-counselor conferences (10 each), parent conferences (9), consultant and inservice help to teachers (7), group counseling (6), and direct classroom assistance to teachers (4).

Health Services Abstract

Pupils	51,251
Pupils (nonpublic)	1,897
Elementary Schools	55
Elementary Schools (nonpublic)	32
Staff nurses	40
Other personnel	10
Approximate Cost	$703,318

DESCRIPTION: The health services component, administered by zones A and B, provided diagnostic services and expedited remediation of health defects. The component served more than 51,000 pupils, pre-kindergarten through sixth grade, in 19 schools in Zone A, and in 36 schools in Zone B; additionally, it served almost 1900 pupils enrolled in specially funded reading and mathematics projects in 32 nonpublic schools. The Health Resource Unit conducted tuberculin skin tests and used its dental trailer to provide dental care. Thirty-two specially funded nurses, including one supervisor and two nurses utilized in tuberculosis survey, were assigned to the 55 public schools. Two additional nurses worked in the 15 schools having Follow Through Programs. Six nurses served the 32 nonpublic schools. The 55 Title I public schools received the prorated services of 7.5 physicians. One school dentist was assigned to the Follow Through program and one dentist, working for three months under a minigrant, served the 32 nonpublic schools.

TIME INTERVALS: This component operated from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971. Pupil contacts varied in length of time, according to the nature of the services.

ACTIVITIES: The Health service team focused on the correction of defects identified by previous health profiles or by current examinations by school physicians. Summary sheet identifying defect, activity regarding referral of defect, and final results of referral were submitted for each pupil attended by school nurses and physicians.

Other services included dental care and prophylaxis to pupils without resources, and tuberculin testing for all pupils new to the District. Dental screening, dental x-rays when indicated, follow-up of dental defects, and dental health education were furnished to pupils in Follow Through programs.

Minigrants late in the school year provided dental screening follow-up, referral, and dental education to pupil participants in the nonpublic school program; and eye care for pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade pupils.

Specially-funded nurses participated in the regular District inservice program.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the health services component were
to identify health defects of children.
to assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral.
to correct dental defects in pupils.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Evaluation consisted of a frequency count of health services and participants. Services were compared to those rendered in previous school years. Staff ratings and comments on component effectiveness were analyzed.

RESULTS: Health services were provided for more than 51,000 of the 56,000 pupils enrolled in the 55 target elementary schools and to almost 1900 project pupils in 32 nonpublic schools.

Doctors, nurses, and dentists discovered more than 19,000 pupils with health defects, and followed up on more than 28,000 residual cases. They were able to secure correction of defects for 8500 pupils. Tuberculin tests were administered to almost 7000 pupils and audiometric tests to more than 25,000. The number of health defects discovered was down slightly from last year, but the percentage of defects corrected remained the same. Dentists examined more than 10,000 pupils in public schools, but this was less than half the number seen the previous year. They examined almost 2000 in nonpublic schools. An experimental dental radiographic survey found cavities in almost one-fourth of children previously classified as "apparently normal." Nurses wrote 12,000 health profile summaries, but zone coordinators discontinued the complete health history profiles. The greatest number of major defects were dental, followed by visual and ear-nose-throat.

School staff ratings and comments were favorable, but all personnel were concerned about program limitations, including the need for more physicians. Staff stated that District health services had been reduced by more than 10% from the preceding year and that nurses were prevented by legal limitations, parental disinterest, and sheer lack of resources from rendering more than contingency services. One school administrator reported that federal-District services were not apportioned properly.

CONCLUSIONS: The component was successful in attaining its objectives of identifying and correcting health defects while operating under difficult conditions. Casual services were rendered to more pupils than in 1969-70, but other services, including dental examinations and comprehensive report writing, were severely curtailed.

The innovative dental diagnostic survey was highly successful.

District cutbacks occasioned a loss in services. Decentralization may be responsible for some lack of organization and decrease in volume of certain services.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The component should attempt to maintain the present level of services, with emphasis on the correction of health defects. Lines of communication should be established through the four new service centers with school administrators and community advisory groups. Priorities should be set for the kinds of services desired. The help of paraprofessional medical aides enrolled in training programs should be obtained.

HEALTH SERVICES

Detailed Report

This component was evaluated on the basis of the numbers of participants and services in 1970-71 as compared to those of previous school years. Of the total services reported in the 55 public schools where specially-funded personnel supplemented District staff, slightly more than half may be considered as specially-funded. Services in nonpublic schools were limited to pupils enrolled in specially-funded projects.

The various services of the health services personnel are shown in Table 32, 33, 34, and 35. The number of pupils with defects reported, 20,000, is below the 22,000 reported during last school year; the 8500 defects corrected represents 43% of those reported, almost the same percentage as last year.

Table 33 shows that dental, visual, and ear-nose-throat defects constitute the majority of those reported. Discrepancies in number of defects reported as corrected in Table 32 and Table 33 are explained in the sources of data. Data in Table 32 are from the nurses' logs, those in Table 33 from individual pupil profile summaries. Zone coordinators discontinued the complete health history profiles.

Dental services and findings by District personnel in 1970-71 dropped by more than one-half those reported in target schools in 1969-70 (Table 34). The numbers of District dentists was reduced, and the order of examining pupils was changed from total school every other year to selected grades in all schools each year.

Dental prophylaxis and other services performed in the dental trailer located at 112th Street School were not recorded separately.

An experimental radiographic dental survey conducted in Hammel Street School disclosed that 23.5% of children previously classified as "apparently normal" had undetected caries. Six thousand, nine hundred forty-nine pupils were examined in the tuberculin testing program, with 226 positive reactors discovered.

Physicians' services and findings were down slightly from the previous year (Table 35).

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Of 1357 questionnaires concerning component effectiveness sent to public school teachers, 866 were returned; 47 of 67 nonpublic teachers returned questionnaires. Table 36 shows the ratings of teachers on three component objectives. They rated "identifying health defects" and "appropriate health referral" above average and "correcting dental defects" as average. Of 782 comments received 58% endorsed the component; 42% cited limitations concerning availability of funds, personnel, and time. NPS teachers returned 56 comments; half praised the services, the other half cited the same deficiencies as indicated by public teachers. Teachers expressed their feelings that it did little good for nurses to find health defects and refer children if there was no way to secure treatment. They cited the legal, human and financial barriers in the way. Health services staff reported that the number of District nursing personnel had been reduced by 10%.

Forty-four of 55 principals returned questionnaires, and 42 wrote comments. Many of them expressed appreciation for having a full-time nurse. Four principals believed nurses did too much clerical work; three wanted nurses to provide more health education in classrooms.

Pupil Services and Attendance Abstract

Pupils	27,000
Public Schools	55
Nonpublic Schools	32
Counselors	27
Approximate Cost	$415,962.50

DESCRIPTION: The pupil services and attendance (PSA) component supplemented regular District services in the 55 target schools. Twenty-five ESEA funded positions were allocated to the schools on the basis of the additional funds budgeted by individual schools. Two additional funded positions were assigned to the Follow Through component. Services were provided on request to 32 nonpublic schools.

TIME INTERVALS: The component operated from mid-September, 1970 to mid-June, 1971. Pupil and parent contacts varied in length and frequency, according to need.

ACTIVITIES: Counselors conducted pupil, parent, and staff conferences to identify, study, and follow up pupil attendance problems. They telephoned and visited homes, and maintained liaison with other agencies. All PSA counselors attended District inservice workshops.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the PSA component were
- to increase parent awareness of the responsibility to see that their children attend school.
- to improve attendance in school.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Percentages of attendance, and the number of services and participants were tabulated and compared with those of previous years. Staff ratings and comments on component effectiveness were analyzed.

RESULTS: PSA counselors served directly more than 27,000 pupils, approximately half those enrolled in the 55 target public elementary schools. This represents an increase of almost 50% over the 18,000 served in the same schools last year.

Characteristics of the counselees were similar for the two years. Most pupils were referred for absence, with health given as the major contributing factor. Interview with pupil, with other-than-parent, or with parent was the most frequent remedy of the eight kinds of "actions taken." There were 2.5 actions taken per referral. Sample groups of counselees referred for attendance and discipline problems made gains in school adjustment marks and attendance. Means of school percentages of attendance were numerically higher than for the two preceding school years.

Teachers rated the component average on its performance in improving attendance, and above average in increasing parental awareness of responsibility. Sixty percent of teacher comments on the component were favorable; the majority of unfavorable comments were concerned with program limitations. One seventh of the respondents cited uncooperative parents. One tenth expressed a fatalistic belief that no service can be effective with chronic offenders. Comments by administrators were similar to those of teachers. They also commented that counselors' talents were misused on paper work.

CONCLUSIONS: The component attained its objectives of improving attendance in school and increasing parental awareness of responsibility. Attendance, as measured in means of school percentages, improved. Pupils counseled by PSA counselors improved in adjustment marks and attendance.

RECOMMENDATIONS: More clerical assistance should be provided for counselors. School-community advisory councils should be stimulated to reach disinterested and uncooperative parents.

Continue to consolidate work with guidance counselors. Investigate improved methods of reporting to facilitate the feedback of data to schools; this will require planning and cooperation on the part of various service units (Pupil Statistics and Data Processing); these units were apparently designed to report to agencies, not schools.

PUPIL SERVICES AND ATTENDANCE

Detailed Report

The pupil services and attendance (PSA) component was evaluated on the basis of report card data, central office attendance reports, staff ratings, and comments. Data and responses indicated that the component met its objectives of increasing parent awareness of the responsibility to see that their children attend school, and of improving attendance in school.

Table 37 shows that counselors closed almost 19,000 cases by the end of the seventh month. Projected to ten months the number of closures would exceed 27,000 (about half of the enrollment of the 55 elementary schools). This represents almost a 50% increase over the number of cases in 1969-70. As in the previous year, most pupils were referred for absence, with health given as the major contributing factor. There were 2.5 "actions taken" per referral, with interviews constituting the majority. Most interviews were conducted with pupils; next most, were with other-than-parents; and the fewest interviews were held with parents.

A sample was drawn from the three groups of counselees: "attendance," "discipline," and "follow up." Each counselor selected three counselees who had four or more referrals for attendance during December 1970. Then he selected three counselees with four referrals for discipline during the same period. Three more counselees were selected from a group with whom a counselor had worked for two years; these could have been referred for either discipline or attendance. Table 38 shows that the "attendance group" made gains in attendance, and that the "discipline group" improved in school adjustment marks.

The "follow-up group" improved in both attendance and school adjustment marks.

As in preceding years, absences were typically higher in spring semesters than in the fall, but the longitudinal study of the "follow-up group" shows sustained growth. The increase in absence in the spring of 1970, resulted probably from the teachers' strike.

Table 39 shows the school percentages of attendance for 1968-69, 1969-70, and 1970-71. The school year mean for 1970-71 is higher than for either of the preceding two years; but if the 1969-70 school months affected by the teachers' strike were ignored, the 1970-71 mean would be no higher than that of 1969-70.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Of 1357 questionnaires sent to teachers, 884 were returned. Table 40 shows how teachers rated the effectiveness of the component in fulfilling its objectives. They rated "improving attendance" in the upper end of the average range, and "increasing parent awareness of responsibility" above average. Almost 38% (336 teachers) wrote multiple comments. Most comments (328) were favorable; some (125) pointed out the need for more services. Fourteen percent of respondents felt that parents do not follow through; 10% felt that nothing will work with chronic problems. Forty-one of 55 principals wrote comments similar to those written by teachers. Also, they stated that attendance and community relations had improved but that counselors did too much clerical work. Principals stressed the importance of the counselor's work in the community. Two principals recommended that counselors be bilingual.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Abstract

Pupils	3500
Elementary Schools	73
Teachers	100
Parent Volunteers	1000
Approximate Cost	$372,741

Description: The Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE), a continuing component in its fourth year, utilized classes of Title I and non-Title I pupils to provide opportunities for cultural enrichment and intergroup experiences. Fifty classes from 33 Title I schools were paired with 50 classes from 35 non-Title I schools, grades K-through-6. Teachers of the paired classes met at the beginning of the school year and developed instructional themes appropriate to their goals for the year. The partner classes attended 13 or 14 day-long sessions during the year, either at a school or at a field trip destination; on these days the paired classes worked, played, ate lunch, rode the bus, and generally functioned as a single, large class. These meetings were designed to expose the children to a variety of informal social situations favorable to intergroup communication.

Parents helped teachers plan the program, assisted with classroom activities, and accompanied classes on field trips. Through their personal involvement (almost 1000 parents participated) they expanded the scope of the intergroup component.

Substitute teachers were provided to release PIE teachers for the all-day inservice meetings held six times during the year; additionally, one inservice session was held for the partner teachers by the PIE staff. Teachers communicated with their partners by school mail and by telephone if toll charges were not prohibitive.

Time Intervals: The component was conducted for the full school year, mid-September, 1970 to mid-June, 1971.

Activities: Each K-through-6 class worked with a partner class, usually of a different racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic background, on a theme appropriate to both groups. Themes were most commonly related to social studies and/or science and included such topics as ecology, living together, law enforcement, urban and community life, and self-understanding. Field trips stimulated intergroup activities, provided enrichment for the class theme, and helped the children to communicate through the media of art, music, writing, and photography. Trips were taken to more than 50 different centers and workshops. Two classes, sponsored by the state legislature, made a one-day legislative tour or Sacramento. Later in the year, the legislature sponsored a three-day tour for two other classes. Nevada Girl Scouts invited and sponsored two PIE classes on a tour of

Hoover Dam. Several partner schools held joint picnics for both parents and children.

Classroom activities included exchanges of letters, tapes, photographs, movies of shared experiences, news articles, stories, and poems. Children also produced various reports and research products.

"PIE Happenings," a four-page newspaper of student articles and stories, was published twice a semester and was distributed to all schools and offices involved in the program.

The PIE staff coordinated the program and provided group and individual inservice education for PIE teachers. They also attended numerous School Advisory Council meetings, PTA, and other parent and community group sessions to explain the program, discuss goals and objectives, and to resolve conflicts arising from the differing attitudes and opinions of the people involved.

Description and Activities of Other Intergroup Relations: Approximately 52,000 children were enrolled in the 55 Title I schools but not in PIE classes; they were dependent upon their regular school programs for intergroup experiences. Most frequently reported instructional activities were use of Ethnic Study Centers (43 schools), trips to cultural or ethnic centers (42), assemblies with intergroup or intercultural themes (33), and use of curriculum materials designed to promote intergroup values (30). Pupil and teacher exchanges among schools (10), sister-school programs other than PIE (8), and school newspaper exchanges (7) were additional activities listed. Not systematically recorded was the follow-up of these activities in the classrooms or the direct and incidental teaching of human relations in the school program. Predominantly adult functions related to intergroup activities, such as curriculum development, workshops, minority employment, and volunteer programs, are described in this report under Parent Involvement and Staff Development.

Objective: The goal of the intergroup relations component was to change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience.

Evaluation Strategy: A pupil attitude scale was designed to assess self-concept and feelings toward other ethnic groups. The scale, prepared with standard directions, contained simple, stick-figure choices for children grades K-6. A pretest was administered in October to all PIE pupils and comparison groups. A reliability study, however, made further use of the instrument inadvisable. The evaluation design was then modified to sample pupil opinion of the PIE program at the end of the year.

Ratings by PIE teachers and administrators of items designed to assess program objectives were analyzed. Parent questionnaires were summarized, and results were tabulated. Open-end comments on strengths and weaknesses were analyzed as were recommendations by parents, principals, teachers, and pupils.

Results: The Program for Interschool Enrichment directly involved 3500 children in planned and informal intergroup activities. Approximately 1000 parent volunteers actively participated.

Teachers and principals rated the program effective in providing the children with enrichment experiences, in improving pupil self-image, and in helping pupils develop positive attitudes toward other ethnic groups.

Parent responses to questionnaires indicated strong support for the program. About 95 percent of the parents wanted the program continued.

Sixty-to-70 percent of the pupils sampled expressed positive feelings about the children of other races or ethnic groups with whom they had associated in the program. Twenty-five-to-thirty percent indicated negative feelings.

Conclusions: As indicated by ratings of teachers and principals and comments of parents and pupils, the program accomplished its objective of effecting positive changes in pupil attitude toward other ethnic groups.

Planned field trips to sites and centers which were related to class activities stimulated pupils and enriched the curricula.

Inservice programs and sharing of ideas assisted teachers in conducting intergroup relations activities and supplemented regular teaching programs.

Recommendations: The ideas and techniques of PIE should be made available to the rest of the classes in the school; procedures for doing this need to be developed. Modified programs could be expanded to include other schools if partner classes combined their school journey programs with intergroup activities.

Locate or develop a self-concept scale for use with pupils. Written and taped responses to their ethnically integrated responses should be obtained.

Teachers selected for PIE should have skills and/or aptitudes in human relations. Inservice should be continued and expanded to offer specific techniques and activities for teachers to use. Partner teachers should be carefully paired to insure cooperation and improve planning.

Parents should continue to be involved in the program as fully as possible. School advisory councils and parent groups should work to sharpen program objectives and publicize activities.

Evaluation Strategy of Other Intergroup Relations: Questionnaires to be completed by teachers and administrators were developed and used to evaluate the extent and effectiveness of other programs or activities in intergroup relations.

Results of Other Intergroup Relations: The provision of ethnic study centers in libraries or classrooms (mentioned by 43 principals and 379 teachers), school assemblies promoting intercultural understanding (33 principals and 336 teachers), and the development and use of curriculum materials promoting intergroup values (30 principals and 248 teachers) were the most frequently reported intergroup activities (excluding PIE). Principals also indicated that school journeys to cultural and ethnic centers (42 mentions) and the use of minority group staff, education aides, noon-duty aides, playground directors, and leaders (45 references) were important to the intergroup relations component.

Twenty-eight of 48 principals provided staff inservice training in human relations.

Conclusions of Other Intergroup Relations: Diverse combinations of intergroup activities reported by teachers and principals reflect varied programs in the schools.

Recommendations of Other Intergroup Relations: Principal comments indicate that the intergroup relations component could benefit from more definite guidelines and inservice training for teachers and administrators.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Detailed Report

The Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) was rated for effectiveness by teachers and principals; questionnaire responses of parents, teachers, principals and pupils were analyzed; these data provided the basis for evaluation of the component. Tabulation and categorization of open-end statements supplied a variety of opinions and suggestions.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: A pupil questionnaire administered at the end of the school year sampled pupil reactions to the program. Nine classes, representing Title I and partner non-Title I schools, responded with multiple comments to three items. Three of the sampled schools had predominantly Negro students, two contained mostly Mexican American students, two largely Anglo, one mixed Mexican American and Anglo, and one Chinese and Mexican American.

Asked to tell which things they most enjoyed in the program, 66% of the pupils selected the field trips, and 30% mentioned participating with the children from the partner schools. Questioned what things they would like to change or do differently, 55% of the pupils recommended that the program be left as it is or increased to offer more of the same type of activities; 14% said the classes should spend more time together; 25% wanted the negative behavior of the partner class to be improved; an additional 4% chastised their own classes for misbehavior; and 7% of the children asked for more comfortable buses. Replying to, "How do you feel about your PIE Pals?" 59% liked them, 25% did not like them, and the rest indicated mixed feelings.

Parent responses to questionnaires indicated strong acceptance of the program (Table 41). Parents of Title I children were slightly more positive in their appraisal than non-Title I parents. The percent of parents reporting active participation in the program was greater than that reported the previous year.

Of 906 multiple, open-end comments about the effect of the program on the child, more than 90% were positive, 5% negative, and about 5% neutral. Categories of comment most frequently mentioned included: child became more aware or tolerant of other groups (389 comments), academic work improved (212), pupil has shown more interest or pleasure in school (190), and child has talked about the program with parents (63). The most frequently mentioned of 46 negative comments were that the child missed too much regular classwork, and that the trips were too long and tiring.

PIE teachers rated the program effective on six items designed to assess program objectives (Table 42), and responded to four open-end questions. Teachers indicated that providing the paired groups of children an opportunity to do things together was the most effective means of promoting positive attitudes toward other groups (36 of 75 comments). Joint field trips (23), visits to partner schools (8), planned intercultural studies (6) and letter exchanges (2) were other activities suggested.

Teachers felt that PIE had two main strengths: it benefitted the pupils, and it inspired and prepared teachers to do better teaching (19 comments). However, some teachers requested more assistance in teaching human relations concepts.

When teachers were asked to pinpoint weaknesses in the program, they suggested better pairing of partner teachers, more time for planning and preparation, and assistance with human-relations techniques (32 comments); they mentioned difficulties with field trips and school visits, such as scheduling, bussing, distances, and lack of time to plan with partner (23); and the inadequate scope of the program was reflected in such phrases as too few children involved, too little money, and not enough intergroup contacts (14).

Median ratings by principals indicated that PIE had done much to broaden the ethnic understanding of teachers and pupils and to improve pupil self-concept (Table 43). They also felt it had encouraged the involvement of PIE teachers in the local school community, and had increased community participation. They rated the program as slightly above average for increasing parent involvement and broadening the ethnic understanding of parents.

In open-end comments principals cited as a strength of the program the involvement of children and parents with different groups (35 mentions); developing positive attitudes toward other groups (14), enriching the curriculum (12), providing good staff resource and inservice help (10), attracting good teachers (3), and helping children build positive self-concepts (2) were other program assets mentioned by principals.

Principals felt that the selection and pairing of teachers was an area of possible weakness in the program (12 comments). They said attention was needed to solve problems with field trips (10) including trips too long or too late (4), too few trips to make an effective program (2), too much time taken from regular class (2), and schools too far apart and group too large (1 each). Others commented that another weakness was poor communication (6) between partner schools (3), among all PIE schools (2), and in bilingual communities where printed material should also be in Spanish (1). Eight principals felt the program should be expanded to include more schools and pupils, five said that the PIE organization needed improvement, another five reported that too few parents were involved, and four principals indicated the program had few or no weaknesses.

Other intergroup relations activities, not included in PIE, were also evaluated. Principals' ratings were obtained from two questionnaires, one partly structured, the other, open end. Forty-eight of 55 principals responded to the former, 34 to the latter. The intergroup activities most frequently reported by principals were recruitment and employment of minority group people from the community (45 mentions); provision of ethnic study centers in classrooms and libraries (43); school journeys or tours other than PIE (42); assembly speakers or programs (33); and workshops for developing materials dealing with contributions of minority groups (30). Twenty-eight of the 48 principals responding provided staff inservice training in human relations.

Representative comments by principals included:

> Have hired 37 aides from the community.
>
> We invited speakers of every ethnic group to discuss problems, issues, and goals.
>
> Assemblies for the total school are of some value, but day-to-day values developed in the classroom are of major importance.

Our Media Room uses intergroup material and audio-visual aids for grades 4, 5, and 6. Parents are especially pleased with this room.

Our Cal State College EPIC program, volunteers, Jr. Art League Program and our Comparative Ethnic Study Program allow for a greater variety of intergroup experiences than in previous years.

The component this year dealt with many trips and development of curriculum material designed to promote ethnic understanding.... We need to develop greater diversity in this area.

Most of the negative comments attempted to explain why more had not been done in the component.

We need more guidance and information in this area. It is difficult to get inservice leaders and speakers.

This component has not had much budget. We intend to strengthen this area next school year.

Teacher responses were similar to those of the principals about the most active areas of intergroup participation. Activities most often mentioned by the teachers were the providing of ethnic study centers in classrooms or libraries (379), the use of speakers or assembly programs to promote intercultural understanding (336), and the development of curriculum materials designed to encourage intergroup relations (248).

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Abstract

Parents	Approx. 25,100
Elementary Schools	55
Approximate Cost	$769,426

DESCRIPTION: Parent involvement activities were designed to increase understanding between schools and their communities, improve education, and assist the schools in meeting the needs of youngsters more effectively.

To these ends, school personnel, parents, and community representatives worked together in School-Community Advisory Councils, in Parent-Teacher groups, classes or workshops, and in a wide variety of projects and activities.

TIME INTERVALS: More than 25,000 parents of pupils in the target schools participated in parent involvement activities which extended from mid-September 1970 through mid-June 1971. Members of Citizens' Compensatory Education Advisory Committees and local School-Community Advisory Councils also were involved in planning for summer sessions, June 28-August 6, 1971; parent involvement continued during this period.

ACTIVITIES: Each of the 55 target schools continued to work with its local School-Community Advisory Council. In these groups, parents and community representatives (some of whom were also serving on one of the three Citizens' Compensatory Education Advisory Committees) joined teachers, administrators, education aides, and other school personnel in plans and projects to help schools and communities work together.

Eleven schools reported assignment and activity of school-community liaison teachers or consultants, thus emphasizing the importance ascribed to the component.

Additional methods or programs to promote parent involvement which were listed or described by numerous schools in their summaries were: the use of parent-volunteers (43 schools); visits by parents to Open House, Back to School Night, classroom sessions, or demonstrations (43); the offering of classes or workshops for parents (39); and activity of PTA or parents' club (29).

Parent conferences, which in some cases replaced the traditional report cards, were reported by 25 schools. The descriptions also stated that parents accompanied classes on school journeys in at least 24 schools, and assisted in all Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, Follow Through, and Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) classes.

The following parent involvement activities were listed by the number of schools indicated: work as education aides (19); attendance at special events and programs, such as those at Halloween or Christmas (16); service as block parents, participation in social activities, and assistance as tutors (15 each); and help with after-school clubs (14); home visitation (13); production of newsletter, bulletin, or news release publicity (12); work as room mothers, attendance at grade level meetings, and provision for child care during meetings or events (8 each).

Community meetings were reported by five schools and the showing of educational or recreational films by four. Each of the following activities were listed in three reports: new teacher orientation or "Teach the Teacher" programs; teacher inservice to increase sensitivity to community feelings; welfare programs; parent assistance in the school library; assistance in construction of aids; and improvement of school-community relations through use of community programs and resources. Two schools reported "Teacher Walk" programs which took the instructors into the community.

To promote parent involvement, 17 schools considered as important the use of letters, bulletins, news releases, and other methods of communication. Other techniques included discussion groups (7), workshops (6), social gatherings (4), demonstrations (4), and speakers (2). Also mentioned in at least one description each were: oral language presentations, displays, supervision for children, films, tape recording and videotape, and the use of a telephone tree.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the parent involvement component are
to raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants.
to improve communications among school, home, and community resources.
to assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Strategy to measure the increase in the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants is reported in the evaluation of instructional activities, and specifically in the evaluation of programs in reading and mathematics. Standardized tests were used to measure academic achievement levels of Title I participants.

Rating scales and questionnaires were distributed in March and April 1971, to parents, members of School-Community Advisory Councils, teachers, and administrators; they assessed the effectiveness of parent involvement activities in improving school-home-community communication and in parental understanding of the educational program of the school.

RESULTS: Questionnaires were distributed to parents of children in randomly selected classes. More than 35% (1580 forms) were returned. Almost 38% of the respondents had joined parent clubs, advisory councils, or other such school groups. More than 83% had conferred with teachers concerning their children, and almost 96% believed that their children took pride in the school.

Less than 6% of the parents who responded (as compared to 12% in 1969-70) had been discouraged by school personnel in participating in school affairs; 92% (an increase from 76% at midyear 1969-70) had received information about their children and the school program; and 80% (a rise from 55% in 1969-70) had visited the school or their child's classroom during the year. However, less than 30% stated that they had seen articles about the school or its pupils in local or metropolitan newspapers.

April responses from School-Community Advisory Council chairmen and members indicated that these groups were composed and organized to their satisfaction, and that the groups were working effectively to consider important topics and to successfully complete projects or activities.

Teachers (1767 responses represented more than a 65% return) reported parent conferences, meetings with advisory councils and parent groups, and a wide variety of other parent involvement activities. School programs designed to improve communications and to increase parent understanding were rated effective, though not as effective as they might be.

Responses of 50 principals to an administrative questionnaire showed PTA or parent groups in 43 of their schools with memberships ranging from 10 to 680, totaling more than 10,000 parents. They also reported work of parents as paid employees and volunteer aides, and indicated that adult classes were offered in reading, mathematics, and other subjects.

CONCLUSIONS: Parent involvement with the schools continues to grow, with greatest interest evidenced in these areas: budget; Title I and general academic programs; health, safety and welfare of youngsters; school policies, programs, and needs; community resources and programs; and community-school relations.

Although development of good working relationships has not always been easy, schools and their communities are benefiting from provision of opportunities for parent-school-community interaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Efforts to involve parents and to improve communications among school, home, and community resources should be continued and increased.

If raising the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants is to be retained as an objective for Parent Involvement in 1971-72, agreement should be reached on a method of ranking schools in extent and depth of involvement; progress of youngsters in schools with the greatest and least parent involvement could then be compared.

As in 1969-70, the need for greater effort in publicizing school activities can be inferred.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Detailed Report

Ratings by parents, members of School-Community Advisory Councils, and staff members in April 1971, measured the degree of attainment of component objectives this year.

The effects of parent involvement on pupils' academic achievement are indirect, making measurement difficult. However, some degree of the improved academic achievement recorded in the instructional components may reasonably be attributed to parent involvement.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: An estimated 4415 questionnaires were distributed to parents of pupils in randomly selected classes, the sampling ratio being one class to each 350 enrollment. Returns of 1580 questionnaires (36%) indicated that almost 38% of the respondents participated in groups such as the PTA, advisory council, men's club, or room mothers.

Table 44 shows that less than 6% of the parents who responded had been discouraged by school personnel from becoming active in such groups; this compared favorably to almost 12% last year. A great majority (92%) of the parents had received information concerning their children and the school program, and 80% of them had visited the school or their youngster's classroom during the school year; comparable figures from midyear 1969-70 showed 65% receiving information, and 55% visiting the school or classroom.

More than 83% of the respondents (79.7% in Zone A, and 85% in Zone B where "conversaciones" were emphasized) had conferred with the teacher concerning their children, and almost 96% believed that their youngsters took pride in the school. However, only 380 (27.6%) of the respondents (33% in Zone A and 24.3% in Zone B) had seen stories about the school or its pupils in local or metropolitan newspapers.

More than 275 responses included open-end comments, suggestions, or recommendations; of these, 27 (10%) could be considered somewhat negative; only nine were extremely critical — four of the school, individual teacher, or program; four of lax discipline or fighting on the school grounds; one of cafeteria food.

Approval of the school or staff was registered by 133 respondents (48%); another 26 responses (9.4%) were a general endorsement of involvement, an offer of help, or a request for information. Other parents noted that they worked (16 responses), were ill (9), had limited time with home responsibilities or care for other children (8), spoke only Spanish (4), had just moved to the school area (3), or attended school themselves (2); all seem plausible reasons for lack of involvement.

Other parent comments included requests for more discipline, supervision, or stricter standards (15 mentions); more homework and greater stress on "academics" (12); smaller classes and elimination of half-day sessions (8); and criticism of lunch programs (6). Five wanted safety programs, such as crosswalks or crossing guards; an equal number suggested more workshops, open house programs, or similar contacts. Four saw a need for increased teacher

sensitivity or understanding; and four commented on buildings, supplies, or equipment. Three urged more community participation with less domination by the principal; at the same time two others complained of lack of direction.

Other suggestions by one or more respondents included more after-school club activity, more school news coverage, enrollment of children at an earlier age, programs to build pride in school, and, without specifics, "change the whole system!"

Some typically affirmative responses are quoted verbatim:

> Intensive education program working very well — can see the value of parents' participation.
>
> I'm very pleased with my child's teacher and the school. Keep up the good work.
>
> I would like to personally thank Mrs. ____and Mrs. ____for the time and effort spent helping my children adjust to school. I think they are both wonderful women, beautiful teachers: there are no words that I could use to express what I feel for the two.
>
> I am very pleased at the way the school personals look after my children. This is my tenth child in this school. And I'm pleased as my older children (now men & women) have good jobs.

And, on the negative side:

> I do not have time to come up to the school every time they send a letter home.
>
> Teacher does more criticizing than teaching ... in a harsh manner. Work in classroom well planned and varied, teacher's ability good, presentation good. If child asks questions, or does not respond rapidly — then critical.
>
> Are the children being motivated to reach their optimum potential? No. ... I visit my children's classrooms, and confer with each teacher. I have not been exactly encouraged to be active in school-connected groups, which hasn't surprised me inasmuch as I realize there are groups that resent one's ethnic origin, one's intelligence, or one's educational or professional background.

Fifty-five questionnaires were mailed to School-Community Advisory Council chairmen; of these, 33 responded and reported group memberships ranging from 12 to 53; the average, slightly more than 23, consisted of the following:

	Percent
Parents from the school	48.7
Parents working as aides	17.1
Community leaders	7.0
Teachers	18.0
Administrators	4.8
Other school personnel	4.4

Twenty-seven chairmen (79% of those who responded) considered the number of school people "right," seven felt there were "too few," but none said "too many."

Thirty chairmen felt that the school was making effective use of the council as an advisory group, two indicated that it was not, and one vote was split.

Of the 1578 School-Community Advisory Council questionnaires mailed, 501 were returned in April. The attitude expressed by the council members regarding meetings and activities was generally favorable (Table 45).

Attendance at meetings and informal contacts on Advisory Council business, as reported by council members, are shown below:

Number of Meetings	Number of Members in Attendance	Number of Contacts	Number of Members Making Contacts
1	25	1	34
2-4	83	2-4	94
5-7	138	5-7	68
8-10	85	8-10	62
more than 10	132	more than 10	131

Asked if they were gaining new facts or new ideas about the school, 456 respondents answered affirmatively, 20 negatively. Council members indicated, 454 to 28, that all members had an opportunity to present their views in discussion; and they reported, 434 to 42, that group members worked well together.

The Advisory Council respondents indicated overwhelmingly that council members determined the number of meetings to be held and the topics or subjects to be covered. The topics they considered important included budget (213 mentions); Title I programs (157); health (including drug abuse), safety and welfare of youngsters (59); greater parent participation and involvement (52); school problems, needs, operation, and policies (46); curriculum and school standards (40); vandalism, school security and protection (39); community resources and programs (30); and community-school relations and interaction (27).

Among the activities described as successful in 442 open-end responses were programs on school budget, school policies, school programs, school-community interests, and council and community. Only seven respondents said that none of the topics considered were important, and 15 reported that no projects or activities had been successful.

Of the 2714 teacher questionnaires distributed, 1767 were returned. Responses indicated that 1569 (90.4% of those responding on this item) had been invited to School-Community Advisory Council meetings and 167 had not. By April, 261 of the teachers had attended one PTA meeting, 312 had attended two, and 271 had attended more than five meetings; the average was 3.7.

Responses showed that 796 teachers (45% of those responding) had not been assisted by parent volunteers in class or extra-curricular activities, and 971 (55%) had been assisted by 1 to 40 volunteers. A total of 4312 parents volunteered, an average of more than 4 per teacher.

Asked to indicate the number of parents who had visited classrooms and observed instruction, 1327 teachers recorded 10,391; 440 teachers listed no visits.

Conferences with 31,067 parents were reported by 1614 teachers; this averaged 13.7 conferences per teacher in Zone A; and it averaged 21.9 in Zone B where parent conferences were used extensively, sometimes in place of report cards.

Of 1435 teachers responding, 57% said that parent involvement/participation had increased this year over 1969-70; more than 6% felt that it had declined. Administrators were more optimistic; 73% saw an increase, and none felt that involvement had declined.

Table 46 indicated that the teachers rated the school's work effective in improving communications among school, home, and community (3.4 median on a 1-5, Very Ineffective-Very Effective scale), and in assisting parents to understand the school's educational program (3.5).

Teachers were asked to report and describe their participation in school activities that involved parents with the school. The 998 who responded to this item most frequently mentioned Open House or Back to School Night, programs for special occasions, parent conferences, and the Advisory Council (Table 47).

Comments concerning parent involvement were made by 21 teachers of whom 13 expressed positive reactions. Some representative statements were:

> There is no substitute for parent-teacher cooperation in upgrading each child's school experience.
>
> I personally believe that the active advisory council and teacher aide program have occasioned the growing realization among the parents that there is a place for them in the school beyond a merely passive spectator role. ... I sense a growing consciousness on their part that they are needed and can exert an influence, can participate actively in the educational processes being offered to their children.
>
> Some of the aides (all of them are from the community in which the school is located) have been a good liaison between school and community because they speak Spanish and view programs from the standpoint of the community.
>
> We have had parent involvement with the same parents as we had last year (a small handful). The only change is the tactics these parents have been using. Attitude of "What is wrong with our teachers?" — instead of "What can I do for the school and/or the community?"!
>
> The percentage of parents who are involved does not represent the majority — decisions are being made by a minority.

Principals of 43 schools reported PTA (sometimes called parents' club or parents' group) memberships ranging from 10 to 680 (average, 233), and representing from 1.2% to 70.6% of total school enrollment (median, 21.1%). Six reported PTA's nonexistent or inactive.

Those principals who provided figures showed that 651 parents (an average of slightly more than 14 per school) were active as officers or committee members in parent groups. The groups had scheduled 2 to 30 meetings for the year; the attendance ranged from 9 to 275, with an average of slightly more than 49.

Responses by principals to a questionnaire on evaluation of supportive services, showed that 577 parents from the community worked as aides, clerical assistants, noon-duty aides, or assistants in other positions in 49 schools, an average of almost 12 employees per school. Several principals reported no volunteer help, but 37 listed a total of 504 volunteers who served more than 1150 hours per week in classrooms, offices, the library, or other areas.

In 30 of the 49 schools reporting,[1] mathematics workshops set up for parents had enrollments ranging from 12 to 90 (median 20), and reading workshops with enrollments from 10 to 100 (median 25). Twenty principals reported classes for Spanish-speaking parents, ranging in enrollment from 10 to 80. Seven said that their school had offered or was currently offering adult classes on child behavior and motivation.

Other parent classes or workshops listed dealt with Title I and academic programs (9 schools); first aid, health, child care, and nutrition (4); sewing and millinery (4); pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and Follow Through (4); leadership training (3); human relations, community resources, services and action (3); training for school aides and volunteers (2); and, one mention each, business, new teachers and the community, citizenship, charm, Black experience, Sullivan reading, construction of aids, and demonstrations.

Total parent enrollment in these classes approached 3000.

Thirty-six of 49 administrators expressed the opinion that involvement had increased in 1970-71; the others felt that it had remained steady; none reported a decrease. Reasons cited for the increase were consideration of subjects of interest and importance, active advisory councils and parent groups, the work of aides and volunteers, and a determined effort to involve parents. One principal concluded that the successful approach to progress in parent involvement is "Emphasis on two-way communication rather than public relations."

In summary, the number of parents involved and the reactions of parents, School-Community Advisory Council members, teachers, and administrators indicate that the parent involvement component met its two stated objectives: to improve communications among school, home, and community resources, and to assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school.

While parents who responded were strongly supportive of the schools, less than half of them were active in PTA, Advisory Council, men's club, room mothers, or similar groups.

---

[1] No administrative questionnaires received from Ann Street, Compton Avenue, 49th Street, Holmes Avenue, 99th Street, and Rowan Avenue schools.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

Elementary Schools	55
Staff Personnel	4173
Classroom Teachers	2219
Reading Specialists	326
Mathematics Specialists	118
ESL Specialists	40
Directors, Supervisors, Coordinators, Resource Personnel	181
Counselors	37
Others (Administrators and Special Teachers)	49
Instructional Teacher Aides or Assistants	979
Community Aides	224
Approximate Cost	$1,061,940*

*Includes elementary, secondary, and central office

DESCRIPTION: Los Angeles' 55 ESEA Title I elementary schools utilized local school, zone, district, and community resources in offering preservice and inservice activities.

Zone and district offices arranged programs for reading and mathematics consultants or specialists, teacher-librarians, pre-kindergarten teachers, Follow Through personnel, and teachers of Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) classes. Aides were also involved in some zone and district programs, and in many individual school inservice activities.

Thus inservice programs, planned for all school personnel, were organized by school administrators, resource teachers, consultants or specialists, regular classroom teachers, and advisory committees.

TIME INTERVALS: Staff development activities began with preservice meetings in September 1970 and continued throughout the school year; its extension into the summer session, June 28-August 6, 1971, included a program involving both parents and members of the school staff.

ACTIVITIES: Reports from schools indicated these staff development activities at local level: general faculty meetings (44 mentions), grade level meetings (43), classes or workshops (35), demonstrations (20), speakers (12), visitation and observation (10), and group discussion (6).

Varying according to local needs, the programs in individual schools emphasized reading instruction (22 reports), mathematics (14), orientation for new teachers (6), and classes offered in connection with a college or university (3). Programs designed to improve human relations, and programs in which instructional materials or teaching aids were developed were each reported by three schools. Inservice for aides was mentioned by 20 schools, and the school summaries show that parents were included in staff development in at least two cases.

Zone and district programs featured inservice activities planned for principals, zone personnel, resource consultants, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) workers, counselors, teacher librarians, and teachers of pre-kindergarten Follow Through, enrichment and English as a Second Language (ESL) classes.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the staff development program were
to raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants.
to provide inservice education by
improving understanding of the effects of poverty on children.
improving intergroup and intercultural understanding.
improving teaching skills in specific instructional areas.
improving skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides).
improving skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors).
improving skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs.
developing curricular innovations.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: As shown in evaluation of instructional activities in reading and mathematics, standardized tests were used to measure academic achievement levels of Title I participants.

To assess effectiveness of staff development activities, rating scales and questionnaires were distributed to teachers and administrators in March and April 1971. In addition, programs for specific instructional or supportive service groups (e.g., ESL teachers, counselors) were evaluated within the framework of the specific component, whenever the content of programs was known in time to plan evaluation devices.

RESULTS: Estimates from administrators, ratings by teachers, and reports of teacher attendance at staff development sessions, indicate that the greatest importance was assigned to general faculty meetings, workshops, and grade level meetings. Other inservice approaches, in order of significance, were zone meetings, classroom observation within the school, visitation and observation in another school, school inservice in cooperation with a college or university, and district inservice.

Teachers (1509 submitted evaluations) assigned relatively low ratings to the effects of staff development on their skills or attitudes. They considered it least valuable in improving their understanding of the effects of poverty on children, and most helpful in improvement of teaching skills in specific instructional areas. Objective by objective, no median rating assigned this year was as high as that given in 1969-70.

Most comments on inservice were positive, however, and ratings by mathematics, reading, ESL teachers were often higher than those recorded by all respondents as a group. In addition, more experienced teachers continued, as last year, to rate the values of staff development more highly than did teachers with fewer years of experience.

Teachers and administrators confirmed the value of presentations on techniques with direct classroom application. Relevant topics, opportunity for discussion and questions, and sessions which brought out community feelings were also considered of value.

CONCLUSIONS: Important elements of staff development programs appear to include: flexibility for local schools to meet individual needs; adequate advance planning; provision of time for participation and recognition, in pay or status, for inservice activity.

It follows that programs with the best chance for success will be tailored for a school, a small group of schools, or a specific group of people. Such programs can be developed, and revised as necessary, by the participants (parents, aides, teachers, or administrators).

RECOMMENDATIONS: With provision for and adequate time allotted to joint planning, geographical clustering of schools for inservice could result in more efficient use of consultant and/or guest speaker time. Also coordination and exchange of ideas among nearby schools could be facilitated by such organization.

Area and District personnel should assist with local planning, without decreasing individual school autonomy and responsibility. Their responsibility for area and District activities needs to be clarified, and coordination is needed to avoid duplication of effort.

Inservice participants desire emphasis on techniques that can be used in the classroom, relevant topics, and meetings which provide opportunity for questions and discussion.

Evaluation of inservice sessions would be facilitated if content for meetings were clearly delineated enough in advance to prepare appropriate evaluative instruments.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Detailed Report

Inservice training in ESEA Title I schools was provided by the District, the zone, and the staff of the school itself; other facets of staff development included class observation and college-sponsored training.

Staff development programs were designed to improve skills of personnel in understanding and helping disadvantaged pupils. The component was described and evaluated by teachers and administrators. Questionnaires were used to establish median ratings, and comments were solicited to identify other areas of concern.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Reports by teachers and estimates by administrators of staff development participation (Table 48) emphasized the importance of general faculty meetings and smaller grade-level or subject meetings at the local school. They also indicated that District-wide inservice reached relatively few teachers.

Questionnaires were distributed to 2714 teachers. Of these, 1509 responded to the part on evaluating staff development activities in which they had participated; on a 1-5, Very Little-Very Much scale, they assigned their highest median rating (3.4) to the extent to which inservice helped to improve teaching skills in specific instructional areas. They assigned their lowest median (2.7) to inservice assistance in understanding the effects of poverty on children (Table 49).

The medians were consistently lower than those given in 1969-70. However, specialists in mathematics, reading, and English as a Second Language (ESL) frequently assigned higher ratings to the value of inservice training than did all the respondents as a group.

Table 50 shows also that teachers with more years of experience tended, as they did last year, to assign higher ratings to inservice than did less experienced teachers. The lowest medians came most frequently from ratings by teachers with only two or three years of service in Los Angeles City Schools.

Approximately 100 resource teachers and consultants, representing both zones, rated various aspects of staff development from 3.7 to 4.3 (relatively high) medians. Their ratings on expectation and fulfillment-of-expectation for each item were generally very close (Table 51).

Asked which meetings, activities, or events they considered most valuable, the teachers listed zone inservice (304 mentions); faculty, grade level, or small group meetings within the school (263); District inservice (100); visitation and observation in other schools (100); classroom observation in their own school (47); and school inservice in connection with a college or university (18).

Teachers considered inservice sessions on these subjects most valuable: mathematics (74 reports); reading (64); Spanish and Spanish conversation (21);

general staff development (14); pre-kindergarten programs (12); music (11); language (10); bilingual instruction (10); budget (9); "Schools Without Failure" (9); art (8); and advisory council and community relations (5).

Of the 1767 returned teacher questionnaires on Parent Involvement, Staff Development, and Intergroup Relations, 23 contained comments or recommendations concerning inservice/staff development; six of these comments were critical or negative. Some representative statements follow:

> Each faculty and unit meeting has been most worthwhile.
>
> Staff development is very important to education. I would like to suggest a minimum day schedule once or twice a month.
>
> More emphasis should be placed on school inservice in cooperation with a college or university to increase staff understanding of the children and community served.
>
> The reading resource teacher that worked with me was of invaluable help. I received far more enrichment from the reading resource teacher than I did from the inservice classes.
>
> Job assignments are not being carried out. District specialists, resource and other specialists dodge work, do not report to duty, and show no initiative to help improve the educational program.
>
> Inservice efforts seem sporadic...improvement comes slowly, it seems.

Teachers' reasons for rating certain inservice sessions valuable included: presentation of techniques that could be applied directly to the classroom; help with ideas and materials available; relevance of topics considered; opportunity for questions and discussion; clarification of community feelings; and assistance in understanding community values, goals, and points of view.

Principals were asked to indicate the amount of time spent and the number of participants involved in District and zone inservice, local faculty or grade level meetings, demonstrations and visitation, and visitation and observation in other schools. They were also asked what problems had been encountered, or had made it necessary to change staff development plans or activities. Open-end recommendations were solicited.

Forty-five administrators reported holding from 2 to 35 general faculty meetings a year, an average of almost 13 per school. In 24 schools the principals indicated that a total of 301 community participants (aides and/or community representatives) were involved in one or more meetings.

Forty-six principals reported the use of smaller meetings by grade level taught, special field of interest, or similar division. Forty-one schools held 6 to 60 such meetings per year, an average of almost 17 meetings.

Decreasing numbers of administrators reported the following activities: classroom observation in their own school (45), visitation and observation in another school (41), zone inservice (35), school inservice in cooperation with a college or university (25), and District inservice (19).

By principals' estimates, at least 3300 staff members (duplicated count) and more than 2600 parents participated together in activities other than the general faculty or small group meetings.

Time and scheduling difficulties were the most frequently mentioned problems encountered or forcing changes in staff development plans or activities. "Teachers cannot do all that is expected," commented one of the 15 principals who cited such problems; another pointed out, "Our own staff development will sometimes conflict with Zone meetings or other emergencies so we have had to reschedule."

Four principals listed problems caused by the earthquake and double sessions, and four reported difficulties arising from teacher morale and attitude. Also mentioned were the profusion of new teachers and the need to provide programs for education aides (3 reports); and personnel hiring or assignment procedures (2).

Recommendations made by the principals included: inservice sessions on school time, with pupil-free days or afternoons, or released time with substitutes provided (13); stress on the importance of a meaningful, ongoing program (5); need for increased zone and District responsibility (5); individual school freedom and responsibility for planning (3); and pay for attending outside regular school hours (3), or point credit or professional rewards for overtime.(2).

In summary, success of any program of inservice/staff development is difficult to measure. It is clear, however, that much staff development work is being done, and that both teachers and administrators recognize the need for and importance of inservice programs.

The number of problems listed by administrators may indicate a need for greater planning by or assistance from areas and district, and a need for continuing evaluation and revision of programs within each school.

The benefits of increased professional competence may be reflected in improved relationships with pupils, parents, and staff; and in increased academic skills, and greater self-confidence for pupils. These benefits, however, are not measurable at once but may contribute greatly to the success of pupils in following years; this is a hypothesis which needs to be tested with carefully designed longitudinal studies.

Table 1 --Summary of Reading Test Data for All ESEA Title I Schools 1970-1971

Grade	Group	Pre GE	Post GE	Diff	Objective	GE for 50th%ile[f] on Test	Yrs/Mos Below Grade
1[a]	All	---	1.7	(0.7)	(0.8)	1.8	-0.1
2[b]	All	1.8	2.1	0.3	1.0	2.8	-0.7
3[c]	All	2.0	2.6	0.6	1.0	3.9	-1.3
4[d]	All	2.8	3.5	0.7	0.8	4.8	-1.3
	Matched	2.8	3.5	0.7	0.8	4.8	-1.3
5[d]	All	3.5	4.0	0.5	0.8	5.8	-1.8
	Matched	3.5	4.1	0.6	0.8	5.8	-1.7
6[e]	All	3.8	4.5	0.7	0.7	6.8	-2.3
	Matched	4.0	4.6	0.6	0.7	6.8	-2.2

Note.--Pretest month listed below by grade; all posttests given in May 1971.
[a]Cooperative Primary Test-Reading, Form 12A Posttest only.
[b]CPT Reading, Form 23A, Pretest CPT 12A, May 1970.
[c]Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Reading, Form X, Level II,
Pretest SAT, Form W Level I, May 1970
[d]Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) Form R, Level II, Pretest (same) Oct. '70
[e]CTBS, QII Pretest (same) Nov. '70.
[f]GE for 50th percentile at Spring testing period obtained from test manual.

Table 2 --Number and Percent of Pupils Tested in Reading

Grade	Total Avg. Enrollment	All Pupils Pretest N	All Pupils Pretest TAE %	All Pupils Posttest N	All Pupils Posttest TAE %	Matched Pupils Both Pre and Post N	Matched Pupils Both Pre and Post TAE %
1	8653	---	---	7798	90	---	---
2	7643	(7175*)	---	7091	93	---	---
3	7815	(7110*)	---	7166	92	---	---
4	7463	6938	93	6988	94	5787	78
5	7144	6703	94	6604	92	5553	78
6	6892	6454	94	6466	94	5480	80

Note.--Total Average Enrollment (TAE),
average enrollment for the 2nd and 9th school months.

Table 3 — Two Year Gains in Reading 1969 to 1971

	GRADE 2 (2 Yr Objective=2.0)	2 Year Gain	GE May'71		GRADE 3 (2 Yr Objective=2.0)	2 Year Gain	GE May'71
1.	28th Street	2.2	3.2	1.	111th Street	2.1	3.4
2.	Breed Street	2.1	3.1	2.	Weigand	2.1	3.7
3.	Ann Street	1.6	2.6	3.	Ann Street	2.0	3.4
4.	99th Street	1.6	2.6	4.	Lillian	1.9	3.3
5.	Eastman	1.5	2.5	5.	Nevin	1.7	0.2
6.	Graham	1.5	2.5	6.	Cortez	1.6	3.0
7.	Marianna	1.5	2.5	7.	Eastman	1.6	3.1
8.	Nevin	1.5	2.5	8.	66th Street	1.6	3.0
9.	Rowan	1.5	2.5	9.	28th Street	1.5	2.9
10.	52nd Street	1.4	2.4	10.	Breed Street	1.4	3.1
11.	Weigand	1.4	2.4	11.	Main	1.4	3.0
12.	Belvedere	1.3	2.3	12.	95th Street	1.4	2.8
13.	Brooklyn	1.3	2.3	13.	75th Street	1.4	2.8
14.	Cortez	1.3	2.3	14.	Soto Street	1.4	3.0
15.	Euclid	1.3	2.3	15.	Belvedere	1.3	2.8
16.	Main	1.3	2.3	16.	Brooklyn	1.3	2.8
17.	Malabar	1.3	2.3	17.	52nd Street	1.3	2.8
18.	111th Street	1.3	2.3	18.	Holmes	1.3	2.7
19.	South Park	1.3	2.3	19.	107th Street	1.3	2.7
20.	Dacotah	1.2	2.2	20.	Sheridan	1.3	2.7
21.	Grape	1.2	2.2	21.	Dacotah	1.2	2.8
22.	97th Street	1.2	2.2	22.	Ford	1.2	2.7
23.	Russell	1.2	2.2	23.	Malabar	1.2	2.8
24.	20th Street	1.2	2.2	24.	Marianna	1.2	2.7
25.	Wadsworth	1.2	2.2	25.	Ritter	1.2	2.7
26.	Evergreen	1.1	2.1	26.	Rowan	1.2	2.8
27.	Ford	1.1	2.1	27.	61st Street	1.2	2.7
28.	49th Street	1.1	2.1	28.	Wadsworth	1.2	2.6
29.	Holmes	1.1	2.1	29.	Ascot	1.1	2.5
30.	95th Street	1.1	2.1	30.	Bridge	1.1	2.6
31.	96th Street	1.1	2.1	31.	Compton	1.1	2.5
32.	109th Street	1.1	2.1	32.	Euclid	1.1	2.7
33.	112th Street	1.1	2.1	33.	Evergreen	1.1	2.5
34.	Parmelee	1.1	2.1	34.	Graham	1.1	2.6
35.	Ritter	1.1	2.1	35.	99th Street	1.1	2.5
36.	Second	1.1	2.1	36.	68th Street	1.1	2.5
37.	75th Street	1.1	2.1	37.	Trinity	1.1	2.6
38.	Sheridan	1.1	2.1	38.	20th Street	1.1	2.5
39.	66th Street	1.1	2.1	39.	Harrison	1.0	2.5
40.	Ascot	1.0	2.0	40.	Miramonte	1.0	2.5
41.	Hooper	1.0	2.0	41.	97th Street	1.0	2.5
42.	Miramonte	1.0	2.0	42.	96th Street	1.0	2.4
43.	68th Street	1.0	2.0	43.	112th Street	1.0	2.6
44.	61st Street	1.0	2.0	44.	Russell	1.0	2.5
45.	Soto Street	1.0	2.0	45.	Hammel	0.9	2.4
46.	Trinity	1.0	2.0	46.	Parmelee	0.9	2.3
47.	Bridge	0.9	1.9	47.	109th Street	0.8	2.2
48.	Compton	0.9	1.9	48.	102nd Street	0.8	2.2
49.	Hammel	0.9	1.9	49.	49th Street	0.7	2.3
50.	Harrison	0.9	1.9	50.	Hooper	0.7	2.2
51.	Lillian	0.9	1.9	51.	Second	0.7	2.2
52.	Murchison	0.9	1.9	52.	South Park	0.7	2.1
53.	107th Street	0.9	1.9	53.	Grape	0.6	2.1
54.	102nd Street	0.7	1.7	54.	Utah	0.6	2.1
55.	Utah	0.7	1.7	55.	Murchison	0.5	1.9

Table 3 (Continued)

	GRADE 5 (2 Yr Objective=1.7)	2 Year Gain	GE May'71		GRADE 6 (2 Yr Objective=1.7	2 Year Gain	GE May'71
1.	Nevin	3.3	5.8	1.	Lillian	2.0	5.4
2.	Cortez	2.6	5.5	2.	Cortez	1.9	5.2
3.	28th Street	2.3	5.1	3.	111th Street	1.9	5.1
4.	Ann	2.2	4.8	4.	66th Street	1.9	5.3
5.	111th Street	2.2	5.0	5.	Euclid	1.7	5.1
6.	Eastman	2.1	5.0	6.	Bridge	1.6	4.8
7.	49th Street	2.0	4.3	7.	Main	1.6	5.0
8.	Breed	1.8	4.6	8.	97th Street	1.6	4.6
9.	Holmes	1.8	4.9	9.	75th Street	1.6	5.0
10.	Hooper	1.6	4.1	10.	Dacotah	1.5	4.6
11.	Parmelee	1.6	5.1	11.	Evergreen	1.5	4.9
12.	Soto	1.6	4.6	12.	Malabar	1.5	5.1
13.	Ford	1.5	4.5	13.	99th Street	1.5	5.0
14.	Rowan	1.5	4.1	14.	28th Street	1.5	4.6
15.	Lillian	1.4	4.4	15.	Eastman	1.4	4.8
16.	66th Street	1.4	4.5	16.	109th Street	1.4	4.5
17.	Trinity	1.4	4.0	17.	Trinity	1.4	4.3
18.	Wadsworth	1.4	4.0	18.	Breed	1.3	5.1
19.	Euclid	1.3	3.9	19.	Graham	1.3	4.7
20.	Grape	1.3	3.8	20.	Holmes	1.3	4.7
21.	97th Street	1.3	3.9	21.	95th Street	1.3	4.3
22.	Belvedere	1.2	4.3	22.	107th Street	1.3	4.5
23.	52nd Street	1.2	4.4	23.	Rowan	1.3	4.6
24.	Bridge	1.1	4.0	24.	61st Street	1.3	4.5
25.	Evergreen	1.1	4.0	25.	South Park	1.3	4.5
26.	Harrison	1.1	3.9	26.	Ann	1.2	4.6
27.	Malabar	1.1	4.1	27.	52nd Street	1.2	4.7
28.	Marianna	1.1	4.0	28.	Hooper	1.2	4.3
29.	68th Street	1.1	4.1	29.	Nevin	1.2	4.3
30.	20th Street	1.1	4.1	30.	96th Street	1.2	4.6
31.	Graham	1.0	4.1	31.	Soto Street	1.2	4.6
32.	Hammel	1.0	3.9	32.	Wadsworth	1.2	4.5
33.	Main	1.0	3.9	33.	49th Street	1.1	4.3
34.	95th Street	1.0	3.9	34.	Russell	1.1	4.3
35.	96th Street	1.0	3.9	35.	Sheridan	1.1	4.5
36.	109th Street	1.0	3.9	36.	Utah	1.1	4.2
37.	102nd Street	1.0	3.9	37.	Compton	1.0	4.2
38.	107th Street	1.0	3.9	38.	Ford	1.0	4.2
39.	Second Street	1.0	3.7	39.	Harrison	1.0	4.8
40.	Sheridan	1.0	4.0	40.	Parmelee	1.0	4.3
41.	South Park	1.0	3.8	41.	Second Street	1.0	3.9
42.	75th Street	0.9	3.7	42.	Marianna	0.9	4.8
43.	61st Street	0.9	3.8	43.	Miramonte	0.9	4.3
44.	Dacotah	0.8	4.0	44.	102nd Street	0.9	4.0
45.	99th Street	0.8	3.6	45.	20th Street	0.9	4.3
46.	Russell	0.8	3.8	46.	Belvedere	0.8	4.5
47.	Miramonte	0.6	3.6	47.	68th Street	0.8	4.1
48.	Utah	0.6	3.5	48.	Hammel	0.7	4.1
49.	Ritter	0.4	3.5	49.	Ritter	0.7	4.1
50.	Compton	0.3	3.4	50.	Grape	0.6	3.6

Table 4 — Reading Test Results 1970-71

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
Ann	1	0.8		2.1				
	2	1.0	2.3	2.6	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.8	3.4	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.9	4.5	1.6	3.7	4.7	1.0
	5	0.8	5.1	4.8	-0.3	6.0	5.5	-0.5
	6	0.7	3.8	4.6	0.8	4.3	5.0	0.7
Ascot	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.0	0.2			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.5	0.6			
	4	0.8	3.0	3.6	0.6	3.0	3.8	0.8
	5	0.8	3.1	3.7	0.6	3.1	3.7	0.6
	6	0.7	4.1	5.3	1.2	4.2	5.5	1.3
Belvedere	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.3	0.7			
	3	1.0	2.2	2.8	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.8	3.6	0.8	2.8	3.7	0.9
	5	0.8	3.7	4.3	0.6	3.7	4.4	0.7
	6	0.7	4.3	4.5	0.2	4.3	4.6	0.3
Breed	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	2.3	3.1	0.8			
	3	1.0	2.8	3.1	0.3			
	4	0.8	3.0	3.9	0.9	3.1	3.7	0.6
	5	0.8	3.7	4.6	0.9	3.9	4.7	0.8
	6	0.7	4.1	5.1	1.0	4.3	5.1	0.8
Bridge	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.6	1.9	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.5	2.6	0.1			
	4	0.8	3.1	3.5	0.4			
	5	0.8	3.6	4.0	0.4			
	6	0.7	4.1	4.8	0.7			
Brooklyn	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	2.0	2.3	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.5	2.8	0.3			
	4	0.8	3.0	3.4	0.4	3.1	3.5	0.4
	5	0.8	3.1	3.9	0.8	3.1	3.9	0.8
	6	0.7	3.7	4.1	0.4	3.7	4.1	0.4

Note.—Table 4 is based on median grade equivalents (GE).
[a]One month gain per month of instruction based on interval between pre and posttests.
[b]Includes scores for every Title I pupil who received a test — pre or post or both — at any of the Title I schools.
[c]Received both pre and posttests and were enrolled before March 1, 1971 in the school in which the posttest was received.

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
Compton	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.7	1.9	0.2			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.5	0.7			
	4	0.8	3.1	3.5	0.4	3.1	3.6	0.5
	5	0.8	3.4	3.4	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.0
	6	0.7	3.9	4.2	0.3	3.9	4.2	0.3
Cortez	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.9	2.3	0.4			
	3	1.0	2.4	3.0	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.8	4.0	1.2	2.8	4.0	1.2
	5	0.8	4.7	5.5	0.8	4.4	6.1	1.7
	6	0.7	4.4	5.2	0.8	4.4	5.3	0.9
Dacotah	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.2	0.5			
	3	1.0	2.2	2.8	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.8	0.9	2.8	3.9	1.1
	5	0.8	3.5	4.0	0.5	3.5	4.1	0.6
	6	0.7	3.8	4.6	0.8	3.7	4.6	0.9
Eastman	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.5	0.9			
	3	1.0	2.2	3.1	0.9			
	4	0.8	3.0	3.7	0.7	3.0	3.8	0.8
	5	0.8	3.6	5.0	1.4	3.7	5.2	1.5
	6	0.7	4.1	4.8	0.7			
Euclid	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.3	0.6			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.7	0.8			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.9	1.0	2.9	3.9	1.0
	5	0.8	3.4	4.2	0.8	3.4	4.2	0.8
	6	0.7	4.4	5.1	0.7	4.6	5.1	0.5
Evergreen	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.1	0.4			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.5	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.5	3.6	1.1	2.6	3.7	1.1
	5	0.8	3.5	4.0	0.5	3.5	4.0	0.5
	6	0.7	4.3	4.9	0.6	4.3	4.7	0.4
52nd Street	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.4	0.8			
	3	1.0	2.1	2.8	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.4	0.5	2.9	3.4	0.5
	5	0.8	4.0	4.4	0.4	4.1	4.5	0.4
	6	0.7	4.1	4.7	0.6	4.3	4.9	0.6

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
Ford	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.1	0.4			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.7	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.8	1.2	2.5	3.8	1.3
	5	0.8	3.9	4.5	0.6	4.1	4.7	0.6
	6	0.7	3.6	4.2	0.6	3.8	4.6	0.8
49th Street	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	2.1	2.1	0.0			
	3	1.0	2.5	2.3	-0.2			
	4	0.8	2.7	3.5	0.8	2.8	3.4	0.6
	5	0.8	4.1	4.3	0.2	4.1	4.3	0.2
	6	0.7	3.9	4.2	0.3	3.8	4.3	0.5
Graham	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	2.1	2.5	0.4			
	3	1.0	2.7	2.6	-0.1			
	4	0.8	3.3	3.5	0.2	3.3	3.5	0.2
	5	0.8	3.6	4.1	0.5	3.7	4.2	0.5
	6	0.7	4.1	4.7	0.6	4.1	4.7	0.6
Grape	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.2	0.4			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.1	0.2			
	4	0.8	2.3	2.9	0.6	2.3	3.0	0.7
	5	0.8	3.4	3.8	0.4	3.6	3.8	0.2
	6	0.7	3.6	3.6	0.0	3.6	3.7	0.1
Hammel	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.5	1.9	0.4			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.4	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.2	0.3	2.9	3.2	0.3
	5	0.8	3.4	3.9	0.5	3.4	3.9	0.5
	6	0.7	3.8	4.1	0.3	3.8	4.1	0.3
Harrison	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.5	1.9	0.4			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.5	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.4	0.8	2.7	3.5	0.8
	5	0.8	3.5	3.9	0.4	3.5	3.9	0.4
	6	0.7	4.3	4.8	0.5	4.3	5.1	0.8
Holmes	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	3.1	2.1	-1.0			
	3	1.0	3.7	2.7	-1.0			
	4	0.8	3.2	3.6	0.4	3.2	3.9	0.7
	5	0.8	4.2	4.9	0.7	4.2	5 3	1.1
	6	0.7	3.6	4.7	1.1	3.8	5.1	1.3

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
Hooper	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.0	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.2	0.2			
	4	0.8	2.5	3.1	0.6	2.5	3.1	0.6
	5	0.8	3.4	4.1	0.7	3.4	4.1	0.7
	6	0.7	3.7	4.3	0.6	3.7	4.3	0.6
Lillian	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	2.1	1.9	-0.2			
	3	1.0	2.6	3.3	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.6	0.7	2.9	3.6	0.7
	5	0.8	3.5	4.4	0.9	3.5	4.7	1.2
	6	0.7	4.6	5.4	0.8	5.3	6.3	1.0
Main	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.3	0.5			
	3	1.0	2.2	3.0	0.8			
	4	0.8	2.8	3.7	0.9	2.7	3.5	0.8
	5	0.8	3.5	3.9	0.4	3.6	4.1	0.5
	6	0.7	4.1	5.0	0.9	4.3	5.0	0.7
Malabar	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.3	0.7			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.8	0.8			
	4	0.8	2.8	3.8	1.0	2.8	3.9	1.1
	5	0.8	3.7	4.1	0.4	3.7	4.1	0.4
	6	0.7	4.3	5.1	0.8	4.1	5.0	0.9
Marianna	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.9	2.5	0.6			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.7	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.7	3.4	0.7	2.7	3.4	0.7
	5	0.8	3.7	4.0	0.3	3.7	4.1	0.4
	6	0.7	4.2	4.8	0.6	4.2	4.7	0.5
Miramonte	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.0	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.5	0.5			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.3	0.4	2.9	3.4	0.5
	5	0.8	3.4	3.6	0.2	3.4	3.7	0.3
	6	0.7	3.8	4.3	0.5	3.8	4.3	0.5
Murchison	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.1	1.9	0.8			
	3	1.0	1.8	1.9	0.1			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.0	0.4	2.7	3.1	0.4
	5	0.8	2.9	3.5	0.6	3.0	3.5	0.5
	6	0.7	3.6	4.5	0.9	3.6	4.5	0.9

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
Nevin	1	0.8		1.9				
	2	1.0	2.0	2.5	0.5			
	3	1.0	2.5	0.2	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.4	4.1	1.7	2.4	4.3	1.9
	5	0.8	3.5	5.8	2.3	3.8	5.8	2.0
	6	0.7	4.0	4.3	0.3	3.9	4.3	0.4
95th Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.1	0.4			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.8	0.8			
	4	0.8	2.6	4.3	1.7	2.5	4.5	2.0
	5	0.8	3.4	3.9	0.5	3.4	4.0	0.6
	6	0.7	3.6	4.3	0.7	3.6	4.3	0.7
99th Street	1	0.8		2.0				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.6	0.8			
	3	1.0	2.6	2.5	-0.1			
	4	0.8	2.5	3.6	1.1	2.5	3.7	1.2
	5	0.8	3.3	3.6	0.3	3.3	3.7	0.4
	6	0.7	4.1	5.0	0.9	4.3	5.0	0.7
97th Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.4	2.2	0.8			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.5	0.7			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.7	0.8	2.9	3.7	0.8
	5	0.8	3.4	3.9	0.5	3.4	4.0	0.6
	6	0.7	3.8	4.6	0.8	3.8	4.6	0.8
96th Street	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.9	2.1	0.2			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.4	0.5			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.2	0.6	2.6	3.2	0.6
	5	0.8	3.4	3.9	0.5	3.3	3.6	0.3
	6	0.7	3.8	4.6	0.8	3.8	4.6	0.8
111th Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.3	0.6			
	3	1.0	2.8	3.4	0.6			
	4	0.8	2.7	3.9	1.2	2.7	3.8	1.1
	5	0.8	3.4	5.0	1.6	3.5	5.0	1.5
	6	0.7	4.0	5.1	1.1	4.2	5.1	0.9
109th Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	2.0	2.1	0.1			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.2	0.4			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.2	0.6	2.6	3.2	0.6
	5	0.8	3.3	3.9	0.6	3.2	3.9	0.7
	6	0.7	3.6	4.5	0.9	4.3	4.6	0.3

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
102nd Street	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.9	1.7	-0.2			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.2	0.4			
	4	0.8	2.5	3.4	0.9	2.6	3.4	0.8
	5	0.8	3.4	3.8	0.4	3.4	3.8	0.4
	6	0.7	3.6	4.0	0.4			
107th Street	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.7	1.9	0.2			
	3	1.0	2.3	2.7	0.4			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.4	0.5	2.9	3.5	0.6
	5	0.8	3.4	3.9	0.5	3.4	4.0	0.6
	6	0.7	3.6	4.5	0.9	3.7	4.5	0.8
112th Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.1	0.5			
	3	1.0	2.1	2.6	0.5			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.2	0.3	3.0	3.2	0.2
	5	0.8	3.4	3.7	0.3	3.4	3.7	0.3
	6	0.7	3.6	4.3	0.7	4.0	4.6	0.6
Parmelee	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.1	0.5			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.3	0.4			
	4	0.8	2.9	5.5	2.6	2.9	5.7	2.8
	5	0.8	5.5	5.1	-0.4	5.6	5.3	-0.3
	6	0.7	3.7	4.3	0.6	3.8	4.4	0.6
Ritter	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.1	0.3			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.7	0.9			
	4	0.8	3.1	3.5	0.4	3.2	3.6	0.4
	5	0.8	3.1	3.5	0.4	3.1	3.5	0.4
	6	0.7	3.8	4.1	0.3	4.9	4.1	-0.8
Rowan	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.5	0.7			
	3	1.0	2.3	2.8	0.5			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.5	0.9	2.6	3.5	0.9
	5	0.8	3.4	4.1	0.7	3.4	4.2	0.8
	6	0.7	3.9	4.6	0.7	4.0	4.6	0.6
Russell	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.9	2.2	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.5	2.5	0.0			
	4	0.8	2.8	3.4	0.6	2.9	3.4	0.5
	5	0.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	3.9	3.8	-0.1
	6	0.7	3.7	4.3	0.6	3.6	4.3	0.7

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
Second	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.4	2.1	0.7			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.2	0.4			
	4	0.8	2.7	2.9	0.2	2.7	2.9	0.2
	5	0.8	3.4	3.7	0.3			
	6	0.7	3.1	3.9	0.8	3.1	3.9	0.8
75th Street	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.6	2.1	0.5			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.8	0.9			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.8	0.9	2.9	3.8	0.9
	5	0.8	3.2	3.7	0.5	3.2	3.8	0.6
	6	0.7	4.2	5.0	0.8			
Sheridan	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.5	2.1	0.6			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.7	0.9			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.4	0.5	2.9	3.5	0.6
	5	0.8	3.5	4.0	0.5	3.5	4.1	0.6
	6	0.7	3.8	4.5	0.7	3.9	4.5	0.6
68th Street	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.0	0.3			
	3	1.0	2.4	2.5	0.1			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.3	0.4	2.9	3.4	0.5
	5	0.8	3.4	4.1	0.7	3.4	4.1	0.7
	6	0.7	3.9	4.1	0.2	3.9	4.2	0.3
61st Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.5	2.0	0.5			
	3	1.0	1.9	2.7	0.8			
	4	0.8	2.5	3.2	0.7	2.5	3.4	0.9
	5	0.8	3.4	3.8	0.4	3.4	3.9	0.5
	6	0.7	4.0	4.5	0.5	4.0	4.7	0.7
66th Street	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.9	2.1	0.2			
	3	1.0	2.5	3.0	0.5			
	4	0.8	2.9	4.4	1.5	2.9	4.5	1.6
	5	0.8	3.7	4.5	0.8	3.8	4.9	1.1
	6	0.7	4.3	5.3	1.0	4.3	5.3	1.0
Soto	1	0.8		1.6				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.0	0.2			
	3	1.0	2.4	3.0	0.6			
	4	0.8	3.1	3.9	0.8	3.1	3.8	0.7
	5	0.8	3.4	4.6	1.2	3.4	4.7	1.3
	6	0.7	4.1	4.6	0.5	4.1	4.8	0.7

Table 4 (Continued)

SCHOOL	GRADE	OBJECTIVE	ALL PUPILS Pre GE	ALL PUPILS Post GE	ALL PUPILS Diff GE	MATCHED PUPILS Pre GE	MATCHED PUPILS Post GE	MATCHED PUPILS Diff GE
South Park	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.3	0.6			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.1	0.3			
	4	0.8	2.9	3.4	0.5	2.8	3.4	0.6
	5	0.8	3.3	3.8	0.5	3.4	3.9	0.5
	6	0.7	3.6	4.5	0.9	3.7	4.6	0.9
Trinity	1	0.8		1.5				
	2	1.0	1.9	2.0	0.1			
	3	1.0	2.2	2.6	0.4			
	4	0.8	2.6	3.4	0.8	2.6	3.5	0.9
	5	0.8	3.5	4.0	0.5	3.6	4.0	0.4
	6	0.7	3.7	4.3	0.6	3.8	4.5	0.7
20th Street	1	0.8		2.1				
	2	1.0	2.5	2.2	-0.3			
	3	1.0	2.0	2.5	0.5			
	4	0.8	3.1	3.2	0.1	3.2	3.2	0.0
	5	0.8	3.4	4.1	0.7	3.4	4.3	0.9
	6	0.7	3.9	4.3	0.4	3.9	4.1	0.2
28th Street	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	2.2	3.2	1.0			
	3	1.0	3.6	2.9	-0.7			
	4	0.8	2.9	4.7	1.8	2.9	4.3	1.4
	5	0.8	4.0	5.1	1.1	4.7	5.2	0.5
	6	0.7	3.7	4.6	0.9	3.8	4.6	0.8
Utah	1	0.8		1.7				
	2	1.0	1.7	1.7	0.0			
	3	1.0	1.8	2.1	0.3			
	4	0.8	2.5	3.2	0.7	2.5	3.3	0.8
	5	0.8	3.1	3.5	0.4	3.1	3.5	0.4
	6	0.7	3.6	4.2	0.6	3.7	4.3	0.6
Wadsworth	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.7	2.2	0.5			
	3	1.0	2.1	2.6	0.5			
	4	0.8	3.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	4.2	1.2
	5	0.8	3.4	4.0	0.6	3.5	4.1	0.6
	6	0.7	4.0	4.5	0.5	4.2	4.7	0.5
Weigand	1	0.8		1.8				
	2	1.0	1.8	2.4	0.6			
	3	1.0	2.4	3.7	1.3			
	4	0.8	2.8	3.2	0.4	2.8	3.1	0.3
	5	0.8	3.1	3.4	0.3	3.1	3.6	0.5
	6	0.7	3.7	3.8	0.1	3.7	3.8	0.1

Table 5 — Comparison of Test Scores and Gains
In 55 Elementary Schools, 1969-70 and 1970-71

READING

Grade	Year	Pre GE*	Post GE*	Difference	Objective	GE for 50th %ile on Test	Yrs/Mos Below Grade
1	'69-70		1.8	(0.8)	(0.8)	1.8	0.0
1	'70-71		1.7	(0.7)	(0.8)	1.8	-0.1
2	'69-70	1.5	2.0	0.5	1.0	2.8	-0.8
2	'70-71	1.8	2.1	0.3	1.0	2.8	-0.7
3	'69-70	1.9	2.8	0.9	1.0	3.8	-1.0
3	'70-71	2.0	2.6	0.6	1.0	3.8	-1.2
4	'69-70	2.9	3.8	0.9	0.7	4.8	-1.0
4	'70-71	2.8	3.5	0.7	0.8	4.8	-1.3
5	'69-70	3.3	4.1	0.8	0.7	5.8	-1.7
5	'70-71	3.5	4.1	0.6	0.8	5.8	-1.7
6	'69-70	3.8	4.7	0.9	0.6	6.8	-2.1
6	'70-71	4.0	4.6	0.6	0.7	6.8	-2.2

ARITHMETIC

Grade	Year	Pre GE*	Post GE*	Difference	Objective	GE for 50th %ile on Test	Yrs/Mos Below Grade
3	'69-70	1.9	3.0	1.1	0.7	3.8	-0.8
3	'70-71	2.0	3.0	1.0	0.8	3.8	-0.8
4	'69-70	2.8	3.9	1.1	0.7	4.7	-0.8
4	'70-71	2.6	3.6	1.0	0.8	4.7	-1.1
5	'69-70	3.5	4.6	1.1	0.7	5.7	-1.1
5	'70-71	3.5	4.4	0.9	0.8	5.7	-1.3
6	'69-70	4.5	5.2	0.7	0.6	6.7	-1.5
6	'70-71	4.5	5.1	0.6	0.7	6.7	-1.6

*Grade Equivalent (GE) based on median raw scores
Grades 1-3 in Reading - All pupils
All others - Matched

Table 6 — Two Year Grade Equivalent Gains in Mathematics

GROUP	OCTOBER 1969 GRADE	OCTOBER 1969 GE	MAY 1971 GRADE	MAY 1971 GE	TWO YEAR GE GAIN[a]
A	3	1.9	4	3.6	1.7
B	4	2.8	5	4.4	1.6
C	5	3.5	6	5.1	1.6

Note.—Grade Equivalents (GE) based on matched median scores
[a]17 months of instruction

Table 7 — Comparison of 1969-70 With 1970-71 Decrements From National Norm Grade Equivalents for Posttests

GRADE	MAY 1970 GE	MAY 1970 DECREMENT	MAY 1971 GE	MAY 1971 DECREMENT	DECREMENT INCREASE
3	3.0	0.9	3.0	0.9	0.0
4	3.9	1.0	3.6	1.3	0.3
5	4.6	1.3	4.4	1.5	0.2
6	5.2	1.7	5.1	1.8	0.1

Note.—Grade Equivalents (GE) based on matched median scores

Table 8 — Mathematics Test Results by Schools

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
Ann	3	62	2.3	3.0	0.7
	4	3	3.2	4.6	1.4
	5	21	3.4	4.1	0.7
	6	36	4.7	5.3	0.6
Ascot	3	127	2.1	3.5	1.4
	4	97	2.8	3.5	0.7
	5	104	3.4	4.4	1.0
	6	83	4.6	5.7	1.1
Belvedere	3	123	1.9	2.9	1.0
	4	121	2.8	3.9	1.1
	5	110	3.9	4.9	1.0
	6	123	4.7	5.4	0.7
Breed	3	54	2.1	3.1	1.0
	4	46	2.7	4.2	1.5
	5	37	3.9	4.3	0.4
	6	59	5.2	6.2	1.0
Bridge	3	31	1.8	3.5	1.7
	4	44	2.5	4.0	1.5
	5	32	4.1	5.8	1.7
	6	55	4.9	5.2	0.3
Brooklyn	3	80	2.3	2.8	0.5
	4	87	2.7	3.6	0.9
	5	88	3.5	4.2	0.7
	6	83	4.3	5.1	0.8
Compton	3	65	2.0	2.3	0.3
	4	56	2.5	3.2	0.7
	5	45	3.4	4.2	0.8
	6	66	4.1	4.6	0.5
Cortez	3	138	2.0	4.1	2.1
	4	128	2.8	4.2	1.4
	5	139	3.9	5.0	1.1
	6	125	5.0	6.2	1.2

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.
[a]Grade equivalent is based on median raw scores.
[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

Table 8 (Cont.)

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
Dacotah	3	121	2.3	3.1	0.8
	4	12	4.2	5.6	1.4
	5	103	3.9	4.6	0.7
	6	81	4.6	5.2	0.6
Eastman	3	164	2.1	3.5	1.4
	4	202	2.6	4.1	1.5
	5	147	3.8	5.3	1.5
	6	183	-	-	-
Euclid	3	114	2.1	3.3	1.2
	4	112	2.7	4.2	1.5
	5	96	3.7	4.7	1.0
	6	105	5.0	6.1	1.1
Evergreen	3	121	1.6	3.3	1.7
	4	117	2.6	4.0	1.4
	5	103	3.5	4.5	1.0
	6	96	4.7	5.2	0.5
52nd Street	3	166	2.3	3.3	1.0
	4	152	3.0	3.6	0.6
	5	169	3.6	4.5	0.9
	6	153	4.5	5.2	0.7
Ford	3	129	2.0	3.3	1.3
	4	136	2.6	4.1	1.5
	5	117	4.5	5.3	0.8
	6	92	4.7	4.9	0.2
49th Street	3	105	1.9	2.8	0.9
	4	97	2.4	3.2	0.8
	5	99	3.3	4.9	1.6
	6	107	4.2	4.7	0.5
Graham	3	127	2.3	3.3	1.0
	4	130	2.9	3.6	0.7
	5	122	3.6	4.4	0.8
	6	112	4.4	4.8	0.4
Grape	3	90	1.8	2.5	0.7
	4	94	2.5	2.8	0.3
	5	80	3.3	3.6	0.3
	6	63	4.2	4.5	0.3

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.

[a]Grade equivalent is based on median raw scores.

[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

Table 8 (Cont.)

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
Hammel	3	116	2.1	3.1	1.0
	4	93	2.7	3.3	0.6
	5	98	3.4	4.1	0.7
	6	122	4.4	4.8	0.4
Harrison	3	115	2.1	3.1	1.0
	4	89	2.8	3.5	0.7
	5	83	3.7	4.6	0.9
	6	72	4.6	5.4	0.8
Holmes	3	111	2.3	3.3	1.0
	4	78	3.1	4.2	1.1
	5	61	4.4	5.2	0.8
	6	70	4.7	5.4	0.7
Hooper	3	137	2.0	2.9	0.9
	4	168	2.5	3.5	1.0
	5	119	3.5	4.3	0.8
	6	161	4.2	4.7	0.5
Lillian	3	72	2.0	3.4	1.4
	4	60	2.8	4.3	1.5
	5	51	3.6	5.2	1.6
	6	65	5.2	6.1	0.9
Main	3	133	1.9	3.4	1.5
	4	131	2.6	3.6	1.0
	5	103	3.4	4.4	1.0
	6	122	4.2	4.9	0.7
Malabar	3	140	1.8	2.9	1.1
	4	137	2.6	3.8	1.2
	5	157	3.9	4.4	0.5
	6	109	4.7	5.7	1.0
Marianna	3	63	2.1	2.6	0.5
	4	69	2.7	3.7	1.0
	5	66	3.7	4.4	0.7
	6	51	4.9	5.4	0.5
Miramonte	3	196	1.9	2.6	0.7
	4	153	2.7	3.5	0.8
	5	177	3.2	4.1	0.9
	6	178	4.1	4.7	0.6

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.
[a]Grade Equivalent is based on median raw scores.
[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

Table 8 (Cont.)

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
Murchison	3	144	1.9	2.5	0.6
	4	118	2.5	3.2	0.7
	5	112	3.0	3.7	0.7
	6	127	4.1	4.9	0.8
Nevin	3	67	2.0	3.5	1.5
	4	53	2.5	3.9	1.4
	5	57	3.4	4.7	1.3
	6	48	4.5	4.9	0.4
95th Street	3	158	2.0	3.3	1.3
	4	119	2.4	3.8	1.4
	5	152	3.6	4.5	0.9
	6	108	4.4	5.2	0.8
99th Street	3	78	2.3	2.8	0.5
	4	00	2.4	3.3	0.9
	5	21	3.0	3.9	0.9
	6	00	-	-	-
97th Street	3	124	2.0	2.4	0.4
	4	133	2.1	3.8	1.7
	5	143	3.5	4.3	0.8
	6	125	4.5	5.4	0.9
96th Street	3	86	1.8	2.6	0.8
	4	85	2.3	3.0	0.7
	5	88	3.1	4.1	1.0
	6	87	4.2	4.8	0.6
111th Street	3	92	1.9	3.0	1.1
	4	108	2.4	3.2	0.8
	5	99	3.2	4.5	1.3
	6	91	4.8	5.5	0.7
109th Street	3	51	2.0	2.3	0.3
	4	65	2.3	3.2	0.9
	5	57	3.4	4.2	0.8
	6	42	4.1	4.7	0.6
102nd Street	3	135	2.0	2.5	0.5
	4	113	2.6	3.9	1.3
	5	104	3.6	4.1	0.5
	6	93	-	-	-

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.
[a]Grade Equivalent is based on median raw scores.
[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

77

Table 8 (Cont.)

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
107th Street	3	166	1.9	2.6	0.7
	4	163	2.8	3.8	1.0
	5	160	3.2	4.2	1.0
	6	150	4.3	4.9	0.6
112th Street	3	114	1.8	2.9	1.1
	4	110	2.5	3.2	0.7
	5	95	3.2	4.0	0.8
	6	60	4.6	5.0	0.4
Parmelee	3	119	2.1	2.9	0.8
	4	132	2.8	4.2	1.4
	5	114	4.0	4.7	0.7
	6	144	4.5	5.2	0.7
Ritter	3	30	1.8	3.3	1.5
	4	43	2.1	3.4	1.3
	5	34	3.2	4.0	0.8
	6	42	4.2	4.7	0.5
Rowan	3	144	2.1	4.0	1.9
	4	142	2.8	4.1	1.3
	5	134	4.1	5.0	0.9
	6	169	4.9	5.6	0.7
Russell	3	137	1.8	2.9	1.1
	4	119	2.2	3.4	1.2
	5	120	3.3	3.9	0.6
	6	115	4.2	4.6	0.4
Second	3	85	2.3	3.4	1.1
	4	83	2.6	2.9	0.3
	5	84	-	-	-
	6	77	4.0	4.9	0.9
75th Street	3	191	1.9	2.9	1.0
	4	154	2.6	3.6	1.0
	5	174	3.4	4.2	0.8
	6	188	4.6	5.1	0.5
Sheridan	3	117	1.9	3.3	1.4
	4	100	3.0	3.7	0.7
	5	117	3.8	4.5	0.7
	6	121	4.7	5.7	1.0

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.
[a]Grade Equivalent is based on median raw scores.
[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

Table 8 (Cont.)

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
68th Street	3	129	2.0	2.6	0.6
	4	102	2.8	3.4	0.6
	5	115	3.7	4.1	0.4
	6	130	4.1	4.8	0.7
61st Street	3	114	2.1	3.0	0.9
	4	103	2.5	3.4	0.9
	5	96	3.4	3.8	0.4
	6	102	4.6	4.7	0.1
66th Street	3	131	2.1	3.8	1.7
	4	138	2.8	4.0	1.2
	5	122	4.0	4.7	0.7
	6	113	4.7	5.5	0.8
Soto	3	45	2.0	3.0	1.0
	4	9	3.5	3.7	0.2
	5	29	3.5	4.5	1.0
	6	37	4.1	5.5	1.4
South Park	3	123	1.9	2.6	0.7
	4	109	2.3	3.3	1.0
	5	133	3.4	4.1	0.7
	6	117	3.9	4.8	0.9
Trinity	3	92	2.0	2.8	0.8
	4	99	2.4	3.4	1.0
	5	77	3.0	4.1	1.1
	6	93	4.3	4.9	0.6
20th Street	3	44	1.6	2.6	1.0
	4	34	2.7	3.3	0.6
	5	35	3.9	4.4	0.5
	6	41	4.5	4.4	-0.1
28th Street	3	127	1.8	2.9	1.1
	4	95	2.7	4.6	1.9
	5	81	3.5	4.5	1.0
	6	72	4.7	5.0	0.3
Utah	3	104	1.5	2.4	0.9
	4	139	2.2	3.1	0.9
	5	137	3.3	3.7	0.4
	6	115	4.2	4.7	0.5

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.
[a]Grade Equivalent is based on median raw scores.
[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

Table 8 (Cont.)

SCHOOL	GRADE	MATCHED N	PRE GRADE EQUIVALENT[a]	POST GRADE EQUIVALENT	DIFFERENCE[b]
Wadsworth	3	124	1.9	2.8	0.9
	4	117	2.7	4.1	1.4
	5	113	3.8	4.6	0.8
	6	90	4.7	5.5	0.8
Weigand	3	55	2.1	2.8	0.7
	4	47	2.6	3.2	0.6
	5	63	3.2	3.9	0.7
	6	52	4.2	4.7	0.5
All Schools	3	6026	2.0	3.0	1.0
	4	5444	2.6	3.6	1.0
	5	5393	3.5	4.4	0.9
	6	5355	4.5	5.1	0.6

Note.—Table is based on: Cooperative Primary Test for grade 3; Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills for grades 4-6.
[a]Grade Equivalent is based on median raw scores.
[b]Months between test: 8 months for grades 3, 4, 5; 7 months for grade 6.

Table 9 — Analysis of Covariance Between ESEA and Comparison Groups

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
ESEA Title I	819	5.48	47.19	46.84
Comparison	152	3.45	12.11	13.98
				F(1,968) = 204.35**

Note.—Table 9 is based on ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 10 — Parent Responses

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	PERCENTAGE NO	N
Do you speak in English at home with your child?	20	80	465
Do you feel your child improved in speaking English?	97	3	462
Did you receive information about the program?	87	13	467
Would you like to have this program continued?	97	3	459
Did you visit the program?	48	52	463
Are you taking adult school courses in English?	21	79	467

Note.—Table 10 is based on Form 003P. Maximum N = 473

Table 11 — Classroom Teacher Ratings

ITEM	FREQUENCY 0 Doesn't Apply	1 Ineffective	2 Somewhat Effective	3 Effective	4 Very Effective	MEDIAN
Improvement of pupil pronunciation skills	2	8	54	132	53	3.0
Improvement of pupil speech patterns	2	9	61	117	58	2.9
Improvement of pupil vocabulary	0	8	39	120	82	3.2
Improvement of pupil learning skills	9	11	69	106	50	2.9
Improvement of pupil attitude toward speaking English	2	10	50	97	90	3.2
Appropriate pupil selection	8	7	30	113	90	3.2
Pupils' increased use of English in informal situations	3	22	56	97	68	2.9

Number of pupils enrolled in ESL from your classroom	3-4	5-7	8-10	11+
	127	44	35	25

Note.—Table 11 is based on Form 003T (1-4 scale). N = 255

Table 12—Comparisons of Morning and Afternoon Classes

	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Subtest A, Personal-Social Responsiveness				
Morning Classes	299	13.65	20.46	20.33
Afternoon Classes	60	12.15	18.60	19.26
			F(1,356) = 3.92*	
Subtest B, Associative Vocabulary				
Morning Classes	299	6.02	13.80	13.73
Afternoon Classes	60	5.52	11.85	12.17
			F(1,356) = 5.61*	
Subtest C_1, Concept Activation, Numerical				
Morning Classes	299	5.72	11.38	11.42
Afternoon Classes	60	6.32	10.68	10.51
			F(1,356) = 3.16	
Subtest C_2, Concept Activation, Sensory				
Morning Classes	299	8.56	14.91	14.95
Afternoon Classes	60	9.13	14.20	13.98
			F(1,356) = 5.67*	
Total Test				
Morning Classes	299	33.95	60.56	60.46
Afternoon Classes	60	33.12	55.33	55.82
			F(1,356) = 8.23**	

Note.—Table 12 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 13 — Comparison of Children's Scores in Relation to Hours of Parent Visitation

	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Subtest A				
More visitation[a]	180	11.64	19.16	20.08
Less visitation[b]	179	15.17	21.16	20.22
			F(1,356) = 0.10	
Subtest B				
More visitation	180	5.18	12.48	13.05
Less visitation	179	6.69	14.46	13.89
			F(1,356) = 2.80	
Subtest C_1				
More visitation	180	5.27	11.13	11.32
Less visitation	179	6.37	11.40	11.21
			F(1,356) = 0.07	
Subtest C_2				
More visitation	180	8.35	14.82	14.96
Less visitation	179	8.97	14.76	14.62
			F(1,356) = 1.26	
Total Test				
More visitation	180	30.44	57.59	59.98
Less visitation	179	37.20	61.78	59.38
			F(1,356) = 0.24	

Note.—Table 13 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.
[a]Children whose parents visited classes an average of 88-286 hours/month.
[b]Children whose parents visited classes an average of 15-82 hours/month.

Table 14 — Comparisons of Title I Classes With Control Classes

	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Subtest A				
ESEA Title I	359	13.40	20.15	20.21
Control	27	14.85	17.78	17.04
			F(1,383) =	17.51**
Subtest B				
ESEA Title I	359	5.93	13.47	13.52
Control	27	6.81	10.19	9.55
			F(1,383) =	18.46**
Subtest C_1				
ESEA Title I	359	5.82	11.27	11.28
Control	27	6.52	8.74	8.51
			F(1,383) =	15.43**
Subtest C_2				
ESEA Title I	359	8.66	14.79	14.83
Control	27	9.96	12.56	12.00
			F(1,383) =	22.97**
Total Test				
ESEA Title I	359	33.81	59.68	59.90
Control	27	38.15	49.26	46.39
			F(1,383) =	35.30**

Note.—Table 14 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 15 — Comparisons of Scores of Younger and Older Children

	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Subtest A				
Younger children[a]	119	13.03	19.92	20.24
Older children[b]	256	13.95	20.40	20.25
			F(1,372) = 0.00	
Subtest B				
Younger children	119	4.92	12.05	12.90
Older children	256	6.63	14.11	13.71
			F(1,372) = 2.39	
Subtest C_1				
Younger children	119	5.75	10.40	10.46
Older children	256	6.04	11.57	11.54
			F(1,372) = 7.82**	
Subtest C_2				
Younger children	119	7.71	13.82	14.28
Older children	256	9.37	15.26	15.04
			F(1,372) = 5.83*	
Total Test				
Younger children	119	31.40	56.18	58.28
Older children	256	35.99	61.34	60.36
			F(1,372) = 2.84	

Note.—Table 15 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.
[a]Age at posttest, 52-58 months, inclusive.
[b]Age at posttest, 59-65 months, inclusive.
*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 16 — Comparison of Each School With All Other Component Schools Sampled: Total Test Only

SCHOOL	DATA FOR INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Adj. Mean	DATA FOR ALL OTHER COMPONENT SCHOOLS SAMPLED N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Adj. Mean	F[a] RATIO
Ascot	13	38.54	59.77	56.68	373	33.96	58.92	59.03	0.48
Belvedere	13	29.00	65.62	69.21	373	34.29	58.72	58.60	10.26**
Breed	9	24.22	50.33	57.20	377	34.35	59.16	59.00	0.20
Brooklyn	6	36.33	63.83	62.29	380	34.08	58.88	58.90	0.48
Compton	11	37.73	58.91	56.39	375	34.01	58.95	59.03	0.52
Evergreen	9	42.33	65.11	59.39	377	33.92	58.81	58.94	0.00
49th Street	11	42.36	72.27	66.60	375	33.87	58.56	58.73	4.70*
Graham	13	35.15	61.62	60.89	373	34.08	58.86	58.89	0.35
Grape	13	30.85	47.85	50.11	373	34.23	59.34	59.26	7.60**
Hammel	15	14.40	48.13	62.06	371	34.91	59.39	58.83	0.10
Harrison	10	17.00	48.30	60.25	376	34.57	59.24	58.92	0.12
Hooper	13	44.54	70.08	62.89	373	33.75	58.57	58.82	1.46
Main	12	41.33	56.17	51.09	374	33.88	59.04	59.21	5.47*
Malabar	12	20.00	40.33	49.91	374	34.57	59.55	59.24	7.11**
Miramonte	13	29.23	65.69	69.13	373	34.28	58.72	58.60	10.09**
Murchison	13	25.31	42.54	48.55	373	34.42	59.53	59.32	10.48**
99th Street	14	43.14	80.07	73.98	372	33.77	58.16	58.39	24.43**
96th Street	13	53.54	79.15	66.03	373	33.44	58.25	58.71	4.56*
111th Street	13	45.23	59.62	51.75	373	33.73	58.93	59.20	4.91*
109th Street	11	28.91	48.00	51.60	375	34.27	59.27	59.17	4.37*
102nd Street	12	29.75	61.42	64.47	374	34.25	58.87	58.78	2.68
107th Street	14	34.86	63.07	62.55	372	34.09	58.80	58.82	1.33
112th Street	10	37.20	55.20	53.05	376	34.03	59.05	59.11	2.55
Ritter	7	36.14	59.43	58.02	379	34.08	58.94	58.97	0.05
Rowan	8	48.75	75.25	65.18	378	33.80	58.61	58.82	2.21
Second	9	14.22	58.33	72.72	377	34.59	58.97	58.62	12.27**
75th Street	12	24.50	55.08	61.81	374	34.42	59.08	58.86	0.71
Trinity	12	33.33	58.83	59.38	374	34.14	58.96	58.94	0.02
28th Street	7	38.00	59.29	56.58	379	34.04	58.95	59.00	0.28
Utah	7	29.86	47.43	50.38	379	34.19	59.17	59.11	3.75
Wadsworth	13	39.08	63.08	59.63	373	33.94	58.81	58.93	0.05
Weigand	11	38.45	65.91	62.90	375	33.99	58.75	58.84	1.25

Note.—Table 16 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.
[a]Degrees of freedom = 1,383 for each comparison.
*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 17 — Ranking of Schools by Significance of Differences Between Each School and All Other Schools Combined

RANK	SCHOOL	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES
1	99th Street	
2	Second Street	Significantly above
3	Belvedere	average at .01
4	Miramonte	
5	49th Street	Significantly above
6	96th Street	average at .05
7	102nd Street	
8	Rowan Avenue	
9	Hooper Avenue	
10	107th Street	
11	Weigand Avenue	
12	Hammel Street	
13	75th Street	
14	Brooklyn Avenue	
15	Graham	Not significantly
16	Harrison	different from
17	Wadsworth Avenue	average
18	Trinity Street	
19	Evergreen Avenue	
20	Ritter	
21	Breed Street	
22	28th Street	
23	Ascot Avenue	
24	Compton Avenue	
25	112th Street	
26	Utah Street	
27	109th Street	Significantly below
28	111th Street	average at .05
29	Main Street	
30	Malabar Street	
31	Grape Street	Significantly below
32	Murchison Street	average at .01

Note.—Table 17 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory for pre-post differences; degrees of freedom = 1,383 for each comparison.

88

Table 18 — Comparisons Between Title I Classes and Similar Norm Groups

	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Subtest A				
ESEA Title I	161	13.73	20.50	19.78
Norm group	100	10.92	15.51	16.66
			F(1,258) = 61.68**	
Subtest B				
ESEA Title I	161	5.73	13.27	12.55
Norm group	100	3.53	7.85	9.02
			F(1,258) = 45.54**	
Subtest C_1				
ESEA Title I	161	5.94	11.08	10.97
Norm group	100	5.11	7.70	7.88
			F(1,258) = 51.62**	
Subtest C_2				
ESEA Title I	161	8.68	14.69	14.31
Norm group	100	7.26	11.38	11.99
			F(1,258) = 41.45**	
Total Test				
ESEA Title I	161	34.08	59.54	57.45
Norm group	100	27.55	43.78	47.15
			F(1,258) = 61.94**	

Note.—Table 18 is based on the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 19 — Teacher Ratings of Education Aides

	1969-70	1970-71	Difference
Number of questionnaires sent to teachers	52	67	15
Number of completed questionnaires returned	40	61	21
Percent of response	77%	91%	14%

	Median Ratings[a]		
	1969-70	1970-71	Difference
Helpfulness of aides in working with pupils	4.8	4.7	-0.1
Helpfulness of aides in working with parents and other adults	4.6	4.6	0.0
Helpfulness of aides in assisting teachers with other duties	4.6	4.6	0.0
Ability to carry out instruction	4.8	4.8	0.0
Willingness to carry out instructions	4.9	4.9	0.0
Conscientiousness (e.g., working six full hours each day)	4.8	4.9	+0.1
Rapport with children	4.9	4.9	0.0
Rapport with parents	4.9	4.8	-0.1
Rapport with teachers	4.9	4.9	0.0
Extent to which the presence of aides gave teachers more time for professional duties	4.7	4.6	-0.1

Note.—Table 19 is based on Form 000S-A.
[a]Scores were based on a 1-5 scale.

Table 20 — Analysis of Covariance Between Experimental Kindergarten Groups Test Results According to Teaching Design

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	NAT'L %ILE[a]	ADJUSTED MEAN
Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form B, Total Score					
Funded Teachers with Own Classes -- Model A (class size norm, 23.5)	28	25.32	48.89	38	52.29
District Teachers with Services of Funded Consultant -- Model B (class size norm, 24.5)	168	31.77	57.44	55	56.87
					F(1,193) = 3.588

Note.—Table 20 is based on Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form B, Total Score.
[a]Entering first-graders.

Table 21 — Kindergarten Groups By Kind of Preschool Experience

GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	NAT'L %ILE[a]
Preschool	46	33.39	58.55	59
Community Head Start	79	31.34	61.48	63
No Previous Preschool	375	25.90	51.37	42

Note.—Table 21 is based on Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form B, Total Score.
[a]Entering first-graders.

Table 22 — Kindergarten Groups By Kind of Preschool Experience

GROUP	N	WORD MEANING PRE MEAN	WORD MEANING POST MEAN	MATCHING PRE MEAN	MATCHING POST MEAN	NUMBERS PRE MEAN	NUMBERS POST MEAN
Preschool	46	5.6	7.1	4.8	9.4	7.2	12.5
Community Head Start	79	6.0	9.8	4.2	8.7	7.1	13.6
No Previous Preschool	375	5.3	7.6	3.9	7.9	5.2	10.4
National Median			9.0		8.0		11.0

GROUP	N	LISTENING PRE MEAN	LISTENING POST MEAN	ALPHABET PRE MEAN	ALPHABET POST MEAN	COPYING PRE MEAN	COPYING POST MEAN
Preschool	46	7.0	9.9	6.6	14.0	2.3	5.9
Community Head Start	79	6.8	11.3	5.7	12.8	1.5	5.5
No Previous Preschool	375	5.8	9.3	4.7	11.7	1.3	4.9
National Median			10.0		10.0		6.0

Note.—Table 22 is based on Metropolitan Readiness Subtests.

Table 23 — Analysis of Covariance Between Kindergarten Experimental and Comparison Groups

GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	NAT'L %ILE[a]	ADJUSTED MEAN
Experimental Group	196	30.85	56.22	53	53
In-School Comparison Group (in teacher-funded schools)	36	18.17	37.75	20	45
Target Schools Comparison Group	163	24.12	53.39	46	56
Nontarget Schools Comparison Group	105	29.45	54.62	51	53
					F(3,495) = 7.36**

Note.—This table is based on Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form B, Total Score.
[a]Entering first-graders.
**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 24 — Comparison of Three Kindergarten Groups

GROUPS[a]	N	PRETEST MEAN	NAT'L %ILE[b]	POSTTEST MEAN	NAT'L %ILE
Group I (pre-and posttest)	2009	27.30	9	56.74	55
Group II (pretest only)	348	22.45***	5		
Group III (posttest only)	542			48.27***	36

Note.—Table 24 is based on Metropolitan Readiness Test scores.
[a]Includes Title I, III, Follow Through and AB938 experimental and comparison classes.
[b]Entering first-graders.
Pretest of group I was compared to pretest of group II. The same comparison was made with posttests.
***Differences significant at .001 level.

Table 25 — Teacher Ratings of Education Aides

ITEM	RATING 1969-70	1970-71
Helpfulness in working with pupils	4.8	4.6
Helpfulness in working with parents and other adults	4.7	4.6
Helpfulness in assisting teachers with other duties	4.5	4.4
Ability to carry out instructions	4.8	4.8
Willingness to carry out instructions	4.9	4.8
Conscientiousness (e.g., working six full hours each day)	4.6	4.6
Rapport with children	4.9	4.7
Rapport with parents	4.9	4.7
Rapport with teachers	4.8	4.8
Extent to which the presence of aides gave teachers more time for professional duties	4.5	4.0
Note.—Table 25 is based on Form 000SA based on a 1-5, Minimum-Maximum scale.	N = 18	N = 47

Table 26 — Reasons for Referral of Pupils for Counseling

REASON	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
Academically retarded	505	74
Behavior difficulties	222	9
Evaluation for MR placement	559	2
Need for further data	723	34
Psychological re-evaluation	1347	2
Superior achievement	571	0
Reason not stated	86	4
Note.—Table 26 is based on Form 27.74.	N = 4013	N = 125

Table 27 — Grade Distribution of Pupils Referred

GRADE LEVEL	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
Pre-kindergarten & kindergarten	424	1
Grade one	485	6
Grade two	466	30
Grade three	435	22
Grade four	350	25
Grade five	311	21
Grade six	178	12
Ungraded		
Not enrolled	115	8
Educable Mentally Retarded	1233	0
Opportunity Room	13	0
Educationally Handicapped	3	0
Note.—Table 27 is based on Form 27.74.	N = 4013	N = 125

Table 28 — Individual IQ Tests and Other Evaluative Devices Used

ITEM	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
INDIVIDUAL IQ TESTS		
Binet	1452	56
Leiter	313	0
WISC and WPPSI	1606	34
OTHER EVALUATIVE DEVICES		
Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt	915	91
Draw a Family	253	40
Draw a Person	1694	57
Frostig	3	0
Gilmore Oral Reading	65	58
Gray Oral Reading	29	0
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities	36	3
Pre-Kindergarten Psychomotor	30	1
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	482	6
Rutgers Drawing Test	193	1
Sentence Completion	95	8
Vineland Social Maturity	1	0
Wepman	89	23
Wide Range Achievement Test	2822	74
Other	655	35

Note.—Table 28 is based on Form 27.74

Table 29 — Counselor Recommendations on Remediations

ITEM	FREQUENCY PUBLIC	NONPUBLIC
PROGRAM		
Educationally Handicapped	33	0
Educable Mentally Retarded	1093	1
Enrichment	473	0
English as a Second Language	32	1
Gifted	273	0
Math Specialist	16	38
Opportunity Room	85	0
Physically Handicapped	6	0
Reading Specialist	40	72
Regular Classroom	2006	14
Remedial Reading	60	20
Trainable Mentally Retarded	24	0
PLANNING FOR		
Acceleration	16	0
Age-Grade Adjustment	31	1
Community Agency	100	12
Ex-Educable Mentally Retarded	31	0
Limited Attendance	43	3
PTA Guidance Clinic	25	0
Pupil Services and Attendance	70	0
Remedial Help	2113	39
Retention	182	3
School Doctor, other Health Evaluation	147	41
Speech Evaluation	128	5
Tutor	701	7
Pre-Kindergarten, ESEA	410	1

Note.—Table 29 is based on Form 27.74.

Table 30 — Teacher Ratings of Counselor Assistance

	Teacher Median Ratings Based on Number of Pupil-Counselor Contacts			All Teachers
	0	1-4	5+	
Assistance given teachers in working with pupils to:				
solve learning problems	2.8	1.4	2.8	3.5
cope with behavior problems	2.9	1.4	2.8	3.6
develop positive attitudes toward themselves	2.9	1.4	2.8	3.7
Note.—Table 30 is based on Form 000T-1. Ratings are on a 1-5 scale.	N = 81	N = 389	N = 212	N = 682

Table 31 — Counselor Ratings of Psychological Services

ITEM	FREQUENCY Not Utilized 0	Ineffective 1	2	3	Effective 4	5	MEDIAN
Overall effectiveness of the school's counseling and psychological services		0	1	4	16	13	4.3
Individual diagnostic studies by the counselor	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.8
Individual counseling with pupils	1	0	0	4	12	17	4.5
Group counseling with pupils	6	0	2	8	12	4	3.7
Individual conferences with teachers	0	1	0	4	11	18	4.6
Scheduled group consultant services to teachers	7	1	0	16	4	5	3.2
Individual parent conferences	0	0	0	3	14	17	4.5
Scheduled meetings with parent groups	7	0	1	14	5	4	3.3
Case conference teams	4	1	1	7	10	11	4.1
Referrals of pupils to clinics, agencies and special programs	1	0	0	15	12	6	3.6

Note.—Table 31 is based on Form 012C. N = 34

Table 32 — Summary of Nurses' Services

SERVICE	55 PUBLIC SCHOOLS	FREQUENCY FOLLOW THROUGH	NONPUBLIC	TOTAL[a]
Readmissions	46,727	359	231	47,317
Exclusions	25,243	166	864	26,273
Pupil Conferences	62,155	429	3,879	66,463
Parent Conferences	42,797	1,442	2,646	46,885
School Personnel Conferences	35,362	1,024	2,886	39,272
Case Conferences	3,444	125	462	4,031
Health Education (formal)	1,533	39	111	1,683
First Aid	78,150	751	2,079	80,980
Referrals	25,634	546	2,455	28,635
Number of Pupils with Defects Reported	16,683	264	2,858	19,805
Number of Pupils with Defects Followed-up	23,218	630	4,450	28,298
Number of Pupils with Defects Corrected	7,409	302	832	8,543
Home Visits	5,766	241	488	6,495
Pupils Processed Other than Readmissions, Exclusions, and First Aid	129,907	931	26,873	157,711
Classroom Inspections or Observations	13,122	375	471	13,968
Vision Screened	31,381	913	5,211	37,505
Immunizations	28,659		2,222	30,881

Note.—Table 32 is based on Form 33.182.
[a]Totals reflect multiple services rather than number of pupils served.

Table 33—Summary of Dental Services and Findings

ITEM	FREQUENCY
Services	
Pupils examined	10,456
Pupils apparently normal	2,663
Pupils needing prophylaxis	3,916
Pupils with decay	5,742
Pupils with decayed permanent teeth	2,085
Pupils with lost permanent teeth	3,460
Number of permanent teeth lost	527
Pupils with oral pathology	199
Pupils needing advice regarding irregularity of teeth	1,742
Pupils with abscessed teeth	1,408
Pupils needing urgent attention	2,641
Talks and conferences	1,173

Note.—Table 33 is based on Form 33.653.

101

Table 34—Summary of Physicians' Services and Findings

ITEM		FREQUENCY
Services		
Health appraisals		17,873
Special referrals		4,431
Health inspections		1,107
Athletic inspections (incl. ROTC)		4
First aid		1,037
Faculty conferences		1,280
Parent conferences		1,433
Other conferences		466
Home notices		7,343
Faculty lectures		9
PTA lectures		8
Pupil lectures		33
Sanitation inspections		20
	Total	35,044
Conditions Found		
Malnutrition		368
Obesity		604
Defective vision		1,412
Defective hearing		733
Eye diseases		180
Ear diseases		920
Throat diseases		1,141
Gingivitis		224
Dental caries		4,897
Malocclusion		551
Blood disorder		32
Lymphatic disorder		81
Organic heart		84
Questionable heart		392
Chest diseases		438
Chest deformities		112
Postural defects		1,105
Foot defects		717
Orthopedic, miscellaneous		200
Neurological diseases		230
Emotional disorders		803
Psychosomatic disorders		175
Speech defects		318
CD, reportable		13
CD, nonreportable		96
Skin, communicable		184
Skin, noncommunicable		471
Genitourinary disorders		50
Gonadal defects		69
Gynecological disorders		12
Diabetes		12
Other metabolic disorders		21
Hernia, all types		318
Congenital defects		91
Miscellaneous		825
	Total	17,879

Note.—Table 34 is based on Form 33.6.

102

Table 35 — Teacher Ratings of Health Services

ITEM	MEDIAN RATINGS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	NPS
How effective was the Health Services Component in:		
Identifying health defects of children in your class?	3.7	4.2
Assisting parents in obtaining appropriate health referral?	3.8	4.1
Correcting dental defects of children in your class?	3.0	2.9

Note.—Table 35 is based on Form 000T-1 (1-5, Very Effective—Very Ineffective Scale).

Public Schools N = 866
NPS N = 47

Table 36 — Summary of Health Defects Detected and Corrected[a]

DEFECT	PUBLIC SCHOOLS Det.	PUBLIC SCHOOLS Corr.	FOLLOW THROUGH Det.	FOLLOW THROUGH Corr.	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS Det.	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS Corr.	TOTAL Det.	TOTAL Corr.
Eyes	1,755	748	72	32	362	214	2,189	994
Ear-N-Th	1,648	552	116	46	274	67	2,038	665
Skin	407	238	21	15	41	12	469	265
CNS	283	59	8	5	205	9	451	73
CVS	344	57	9	3	31	6	384	66
Respiratory	263	191	10	8	24	9	297	208
Abdomen	211	54	17	4	55	2	283	60
GU	175	55	9	5	14	5	198	65
Extremities	502	179	28	8	301	16	831	203
Dental	5,991	1,385	371	135	1,183	238	7,545	1,758
TOTAL	11,534	3,518	661	261	2,490	578	14,685	4,357

REASONS DEFECTS WERE NOT CORRECTED	PUBLIC SCHOOLS	FOLLOW THROUGH	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS	TOTAL
Parents have not followed through with medical referral	4,041	92	764	4,897
Child is still undergoing medical treatment toward correcting the defect	1,357	46	233	1,636
Child was not referred to medical care	690	13	158	861
Child was referred and appointment has been made with medical agency	1,043	41	101	1,185
Other reasons	885	8	656	1,549
Total defects not corrected	8,016	200	1,912	10,128
Pupils with no apparent defects	505	21	252	778
	N = 9,902	N = 574	N = 1,770	N = 12,246

Note.—Table 36 is based on Form 012HPS.

[a]Cases processed between September 15, 1970 and May 15, 1971

104

Table 37 — Summary of PSA Counselor Services in 55 Schools

ITEM		FREQUENCY[a]	PERCENT
REASON FOR REFERRAL			
Absent		9,926	52
Not enrolled		712	4
Tardiness		1,534	8
Attendance problem		861	5
Behavior		2,789	15
Special service		3,129	16
	TOTAL	18,951	
ATTENDANCE ACCOUNTING			
Truancy		379	3
Legal absence		7,239	60
Non illness absence		4,398	37
	TOTAL	12,016	
PROBLEMS OF:			
Health		5,824	37
Social adjustment		2,851	18
School adjustment		2,623	16
Home conditions		3,322	21
Undetermined		1,339	8
	TOTAL	15,859	
CLOSED			
In school		11,254	59
Legally exempted		55	1
Out of jurisdiction		537	3
Unable to locate		328	2
Continuing service		2,706	14
Service completed		4,071	21
	TOTAL	18,951	
ACTIONS TAKEN			
Interview with pupil		14,097	30
Interview with parent		8,401	18
Interview with other-than-parent		8,964	19
Case conference or consultation		5,120	11
Agency contact or referral		1,374	3
Special reports		122	1
Phone call home		6,393	13
Home call — no response		2,297	5
	TOTAL	46,768	

Note.—Table 37 is based on Form 34-EH-5.
[a]Includes cases processed through seventh school month.

Table 38 — Means of Pupil School Adjustment Marks and Attendance

ITEM AND GROUP	SCHOOL YEAR 1968-69 FALL	1968-69 SPRING	1969-70 FALL	1969-70 SPRING	1970-71 FALL	1970-71 SPRING
EFFORT (GPA)						
Attendance				1.8		1.9
Discipline				1.3		1.7**
Follow-up	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.7	2.1**
WORK HABITS (GPA)						
Attendance				1.9		1.9
Discipline				1.4		1.6*
Follow-up	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.9**
CITIZENSHIP (GPA)						
Attendance				2.1		2.2
Discipline				1.4		1.8**
Follow-up	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.1
ABSENCES (DAYS)						
Attendance				24.8		19.0**
Discipline				13.1		11.5
Follow-up	19.9	20.4	19.8	26.6	15.0**	15.7**
TARDIES (TIMES)						
Attendance				12.2		9.3
Discipline				6.7		6.3
Follow-up	7.6	7.9	8.0	5.8	5.4	5.2

Note.—Table 38 is based on Form 012PSS. Marks are based on a 1-5, failing to excellent scale.
Comparisons were made with the preceding corresponding semester; e.g., Spring 1971 with Spring 1970.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Maximum N = 166
Attendance = 56
Discipline = 52
Follow-up = 58

Table 39 — Percentage of Attendance in 55 ESEA Elementary Schools[a]

SCHOOL MONTH	SCHOOL YEAR 1968-69	1969-70	1970-71
First	96.5	96.2	97.3
Second	95.7	96.3	96.3
Third	92.5	96.0	94.9
Fourth	92.7	95.1	95.0
Fifth	93.1	94.4	94.9
Sixth	93.2	95.2	93.6
Seventh	93.8	95.6	95.6
Eighth	93.9	77.6[b]	94.4
Ninth	93.3	77.8[b]	94.8
Tenth	93.7	93.2	96.1
School year, mean of means	93.8	91.7	95.3

Note.—Table 39 is based on data from Pupil Statistics and Reports Section.
[a]Includes legally-excused absences
[b]23-day teachers' strike

Table 40 — Teacher Ratings of PSA Services

ITEM	MEDIAN RATINGS ZONE A	ZONE B	ZONES A & B
How effective was the Pupil Services and Attendance component in:			
Improving attendance in school?	3.6	3.5	3.5
Increasing parent awareness of responsibility to see that their children attend school?	3.6	3.7	3.7
	N = 281	N = 585	N = 866

Note.—Table 40 is based on Form 000T-1 (1-5, Very Ineffective—Very Effective scale).

Table 41 — Parent Reactions

ITEM	RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGE			
	Title I Parents		Non-Title I Parents	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
Do you think the program was helpful to your child?	98	02	90	10
Did your child tell you about the things done by the two groups?	95	05	93	07
Do you think that doing these things together made both groups feel better toward each other?	97	03	86	14
Was the program explained to you?	81	19	83	17
Did you attend any of the joint meetings when the two groups worked together?	23	77	28	72
Did you attend any of the joint trips to various points of interest?	24	76	30	70
Would you like this program to be continued?	98	02	91	09

Note.—Table 41 is based on Form 008P.

Title I Parents N = 715
Non-Title I Parents N = 605
T = 1320

108

Table 42 — Ratings by Teachers

ITEM	Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Effective 5	MEDIAN
How effective is the PIE program in:						
Developing positive attitudes of your class toward other ethnic groups.	1	1	12	29	28	4.3
Assisting pupils in broadening and enriching their background.	0	0	3	13	55	4.9
Increasing your pupils' knowledge of subject matter.	0	3	9	24	35	4.5
Developing positive attitudes of your class toward themselves.	0	1	8	26	35	4.5
Helping you develop positive attitudes toward yourself.	0	1	8	22	38	4.6
Making you more aware of problems of other groups.	1	1	7	18	44	4.7

Note.--Table 42 is based on Form 008T. N = 72

Table 43 — Ratings by Principals

ITEM	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
	None 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	Great 5	
To what extent has the PIE program:						
Broadened the understanding of your PIE pupils?	0	2	14	18	20	4.1
Improved the self-concept of PIE pupils?	1	1	11	20	19	4.2
Broadened the ethnic understanding of your PIE teacher?	0	3	12	20	18	4.1
Encouraged the PIE teacher's involvement in the local school community?	3	10	14	14	12	3.4
Broadened the ethnic understanding of your PIE parents?	0	7	17	16	12	3.7
Increased parent involvement?	1	9	17	16	11	3.6
Increased community participation?	6	9	20	9	9	3.1

Note.—Table 43 is based on Form 008A. N = 54

110

Table 44 — Parent Responses

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Are you a member of any school-connected group such as PTA, Advisory Council, Men's Club, or Room Mothers?	37.8	62.2	1559
Have school personnel ever discouraged you from becoming active in such groups?	5.4	94.6	1549
During the 1970-71 school year, has the school sent home letters, folders, or other information concerning its program?	92.3	7.7	1549
Have you visited the school or your youngster's classroom this school year?	80.4	19.6	1564
Have you conferred with the teacher concerning your child?	83.2	16.8	1554
Have you seen stories about your youngster's school or its pupils in local or metropolitan newspapers?	27.6	72.4	1377
Do you feel that your youngster takes pride in his or her school?	95.3	4.7	1539

Note.—Table 44 is based on Form 010P. N = 1580
No forms were received from Graham, Second Street, and Soto Street schools.

Table 45 — Advisory Council Ratings

ITEM	FREQUENCY			MEDIAN
	Little 1	Somewhat 2	Much 3	
Extent or degree to which:				
Meetings were interesting	11	73	409	2.9
Topics were relevant and important	11	113	363	2.8
The group is accomplishing its purpose	35	203	242	2.5
The school values council ideas and opinions	30	184	273	2.6
Understanding of Title I programs has increased as a result of the meetings	32	138	307	2.7
	Not Helpful 1	Helpful 2	Very Helpful 3	
Extent of help derived from:				
Discussions in the group	11	239	201	2.4
Informal gatherings before or after meetings or at a break	25	218	141	2.3
Guest speakers	18	202	157	2.3
Field trips	4	77	97	2.6
Movies, filmstrips, tape recordings, etc.	12	101	96	2.4
Visiting schools	8	105	150	2.6

Note.—Table 45 is based on Form 010B. N = 501
No forms were received from 52nd Street, 49th Street, Graham, Grape Street, Hammel Street, Holmes Avenue, Nevin Avenue, 102nd Street, Ritter, 68th Street, Soto, South Park, and Utah Street schools.

Table 46 — Teacher Evaluation

ITEM	N	PERCENTAGE				
		Ineffective				Effective
		1	2	3	4	5
How effective is the school's program:						
in improving communications among school, home, and community resources?	1712	4	10	40	32	14
in assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school?	1711	4	10	37	32	17

Note.—Table 46 is based on Form 000T-1. N = 1767
No forms were received from 20th Street School.

Table 47 — Teacher Activities

ITEM	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Participation with parents in:	
Music programs, and programs for special occasions such as Halloween or Christmas	312
Open House or Back-to-School Night	306
Black History Week, Cinco de Mayo, Japanese Girls' Day, Brotherhood Week, or similar observances	150
Parent conferences or "conversaciones"	87
Advisory Council or parent group meetings	85
Picnics, barbecues, potluck dinners, or other social events	50
Field trips	25
Teach-the-Teacher program	25
Workshops or classes for parents	19
Home visits	16
Community fair	12
School art festival or trip to museum	12
Book Fair	11
Black Studies program	11
Bilingual program	8
Orientation night	4
Kindergarten programs	3

Note.—Table 47 is based on Form 000T-1. N = 1767

Table 48-- Attendance at Inservice/Staff Development Activities

ACTIVITY	Teacher Reports: Number Reporting Attendance	Teacher Reports: Median Meetings Attended	Administrator Estimates: N	Administrator Estimates: Faculty Involved	Administrator Estimates: Parents or Aides Involved
Grade level, special field of interest, or similar smaller meetings	1374	7.2	46	All	93
General faculty meetings	1361	9.2	45	All	301
Zone inservice	897	2.0	35	607	493
Classroom observation in the school	758	2.2	45	986	1809
Visitation and observation in another school	735	1.8	41	908	161
School inservice in cooperation with a college or university	639	1.9	25	433	40
District-wide inservice	519	1.5	19	376	124

Note.--Table 48 is based on Forms 000T-1 and 000A-1. No 000T-1 forms were received from 20th Street; 000A-1, administrative questionnaires, were not received from Ann Street, Compton Avenue, 49th St., Holmes Avenue, 99th Street, and Rowan Avenue.

Table 49 —Rating of Staff Development

ITEM	Respondents	N	MEDIAN
Extent or degree to which the program of inservice/ staff development helped to improve:			
Understanding of the effects of poverty on children	Teachers[a]	1247	2.7
	Math specialists Zone A	(14)	(3.6)
	Reading specialists Zone B	(23)	(3.0)
	ESL specialists Zone B	(28)	(3.2)
Intergroup and inter-cultural understanding	Teachers[a]	1332	2.8
	Math specialists Zone B	(23)	(3.4)
	Reading specialists Zone B	(93)	(3.4)
	ESL specialists Zone B	(28)	(3.5)
Teaching skills in specific instructional areas	Teachers[a]	1509	3.4
	ESL specialists Zone B	(28)	(3.9)
Skills and use of para-professionals (e.g., education aides)	Teachers[a]	1339	3.1
	Math specialists Zone A	(14)	(3.5)
	Math specialists Zone B	(23)	(3.7)
	Reading specialists Zone A	(36)	(2.6)
	ESL specialists Zone B	(28)	(3.5)
Skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors)	Teachers[a]	1343	2.9
	Math specialists Zone A	(14)	(2.3)
Skills in diagnosing individual student needs	Teachers[a]	1406	3.0
	Reading specialists Zone A	(36)	(3.3)
	Reading specialists Zone B	(93)	(3.5)
	ESL specialists Zone B	(28)	(3.4)
And helped in development of curricular innovations	Teachers[a]	1406	3.1
	Math specialists Zone A	(14)	(3.6)
	Math specialists Zone B	(23)	(3.5)
	Reading specialists Zone B	(93)	(3.5)

Note.—Table 49 is based on Form 000T-1.
[a]Includes specialists.

Table 50-- Teacher Ratings

	Teacher Median Ratings Based On Number of Years Teaching in the District							
	1	2-3	4-5	6-9	10-14	15-19	20+	ALL TEACHERS
	294	459	300	279	207	113	85	
Extent to which this year's program of inservice/staff development helped to improve:								
Understanding of the effects of poverty on children	2.4	2.2	2.5	2.8	2.9	3.3	3.5	2.7
Intergroup and intercultural understanding	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.2	2.8
Teaching skills in specific instructional areas	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.4
Skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides)	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.7	4.0	3.1
Skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors)	2.7	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.6	2.9
Skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.2	3.0
And aided in development of curricular innovations	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.1

Note.--Table 50 is based on Form 000T-1 (1-5 scale). N = 1757

Table 51 -- Ratings by Specialists or Resource Teachers

ITEM	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
	Very Low 1	2	3	4	Very High 5	
Inservice planning and organization						
A. Expectation	1	0	21	41	28	4.1
B. Fulfillment	1	4	22	42	22	3.9
Quality of leadership						
A. Expectation	0	1	15	39	27	4.3
B. Fulfillment	0	1	16	37	39	4.3
Ability of guest speakers						
A. Expectation	1	0	16	43	30	4.1
B. Fulfillment	0	1	18	47	25	4.1
Opportunity for group participation						
A. Expectation	1	6	25	38	22	3.9
B. Fulfillment	3	10	16	29	23	3.7
Quality of audio-visual aids used						
A. Expectation	1	2	24	35	28	4.0
B. Fulfillment	1	0	27	31	32	4.1
Quality of materials distributed to the group						
A. Expectation	3	3	20	38	25	4.0
B. Fulfillment	2	4	19	40	24	4.0

Note.--Table 51 is based on Form 011IP. N = 95

118

SECONDARY SCHOOL COMPONENTS

The activities evaluated in this report were in progress during the school year 1970-71, the second of a three-year cycle for ESEA Title I programs in Los Angeles City Schools.

Junior high school pupils' achievement gains consistently exceeded the previous year's gains, and they uniformly surpassed their non-ESEA schoolmates. Notable increases in the number of staff conferences with pupils and parents, and with other staff members, were reported. Brown pupils in the secondary Student Achievement Centers recorded significantly improved scores in self-image in comparison with similar scores for the previous year.

The components at work were the same as for the 1969-70 school year:

INSTRUCTION
  Reading-Language and
  Mathematics Core

AUXILIARY SERVICES

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

INSTRUCTION

Reading and Mathematics Core Abstract

Pupils		4859
Schools		17
Senior Highs	2	
Junior Highs	15	
Reading teachers		54
Mathematics teachers		54
Education aides III		94
Counselors		21
Clerks		34
Compensatory education coordinator		17
Cost budgeted		$3,323,013

This year, as last year, instruction in the Student Achievement Center (SAC) consisted of a reading and mathematics core designed to improve pupil achievement in these two areas.

The reading/language development component provided intensive instruction for the improvement of skills in reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

The mathematics component presented fundamentals of mathematics and provided for understanding of certain mathematical ideas; it also developed reading skills for the understanding of mathematics as it is needed in everyday living and in the pursuit of advanced education.

Pupils assigned to the reading and mathematics core were able underachievers; they were pupils of average or above-average ability who had been achieving two or more years below their grade level. Class size was limited to 20. Black pupils accounted for 61% of the ESEA enrollment, brown 37%, and other ethnic groups 2%.

Each participating SAC school had a compensatory education coordinator (CEC) in charge of the ESEA components, and a full-time SAC counselor. Each class had a teacher, specializing in the component subject, and the services of an education aide. There were intermediate clerks and clerk typists in the SAC offices serving ESEA personnel. In addition, the SAC schools shared the services of consulting counselors, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) counselors, health teams, and area consultants and coordinators.

TIME INTERVALS: The reading and mathematics classes were conducted daily for an average of 50 minutes per class from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971, except for the two-week Christmas holidays, and the one-week spring vacation, giving 10 months of instruction. Pretesting was done in October 1970 and posttesting in May 1971, leaving eight months of instruction between pre- and posttesting. The pupils took one class daily in reading and language development, and one class in mathematics.

ACTIVITIES: ESEA pupils enrolled in the reading and mathematics core received individual tutoring facilitated by a full-time teacher aide working with the regular teacher in each class. Some of the teachers and aides were trained to use prescriptive teaching, the major instructional technique in the core. Prescriptive teaching consists of diagnosing or studying the needs of each pupil and then prescribing (or preparing) and applying instruction to meet those individual needs.

Experimental commercial study kits, skills books, and independent readers, as well as teacher-made materials, were used to individualize instruction.

Some workshops were conducted for aides, teachers, and counselors in the program to assist them in attainment of the objective.

Counseling, psychological and health services, intergroup relations activities, and parental involvement were used to support the achievement component. (See reports under those headings.)

OBJECTIVE: The major goal of the instructional component was to raise the median achievement level of project participants in reading and mathematics by 10 grade-norm months in 8 months, as measured by standardized achievement tests.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Standardized achievement tests, Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), in reading, language, and arithmetic were administered in October, 1970 (pre) and in May, 1971 (post) to all ESEA classes and to selected non-ESEA comparison classes. Comparison pupils were enrolled in regular District English and mathematics classes and were matched to ESEA pupils by ethnicity, grade, IQ, achievement, and school neighborhood.

Questionnaires were completed pre and post, rating prescriptive teaching and compensatory education coordinators; at year-end pupils, parents, and staff members also completed evaluation questionnaires. An analysis was made of SAC pupil retention and SAC staff preparation.

RESULTS: On standardized tests (CTBS), ESEA junior high pupils made significantly greater gains than did comparison groups: at the .01 level in reading comprehension, and arithmetic computation and concepts; at the .05 level in reading vocabulary, language mechanics and expression, and arithmetic application. Only in spelling was there no significant difference.

Senior high pupils made greater grade-norm gains than did the junior high pupils but so did the senior high comparison pupils; thus there were no significant differences between the senior high ESEA and comparison groups.

The percentage of pupils who met the performance objective of achieving 10 months' gain in 8 months of instruction ranged from a low of 29% of the seventh-graders in vocabulary, to a high of 50% of the eighth-graders in language mechanics and ninth-graders in arithmetic concepts.

In each CTBS area of reading, language, and arithmetic, approximately 37% of the Title I pupils scored at or above their actual grade placement in May 1971.

Pre and post ratings of prescriptive teaching showed no significant movement.

Pre and post ratings of compensatory education coordinators also showed no significant change.

Ratings on the SAC Program Evaluation form at year-end by staff members was generally neutral. However, many of their comments and suggestions were pertinent.

The Pupil Evaluation of SAC form completed by pupils at year-end, indicated that students would like additional subjects included in SAC, more field trips, and removal of troublemakers from SAC.

Parent questionnaires in English and Spanish were mailed to 213 brown parents; only 11 were returned. Black parents were mailed 368 forms of which 117 were returned. These parents agreed that their child reads better this year and has received better instruction than previously.

Analysis of pupil retention based on the enrollment during the first school month showed that 79% of these ESEA pupils were still in the program during the last school month compared to 71% of the non-ESEA pupils in the same schools.

Personnel records of 89 of the 131 certificated SAC staff members were analyzed; 70% met the District ESEA guideline that certificated SAC staff be composed of successful, tenured or probationary II or III teachers.

CONCLUSIONS: Instructional objectives were partially met, as measured by standardized tests.

According to survey data, inservice objectives were not met.

Pupils, parents, and staff supported the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Teachers, Aides III, and other staff personnel need central office leadership in inservice and in the development of classroom materials for prescriptive teaching; this is necessary for the successful use of the mandated technique by teachers, and to the understanding of it by consultants and administrators.

Greater discretion in teacher assignment is needed to meet the District ESEA guidelines.

Staff and pupil comments should be studied for clues to possible program improvement.

More careful screening of incoming SAC pupils and the removal of disruptive nonlearners are needed to improve the learning climate and teacher/aide morale.

Administrative guidance is needed to encourage the development of teacher-made nonstandardized tests so that process evaluation and feedback would be possible.

READING AND MATHEMATICS CORE

Detailed Report

This year, as last, the Student Achievement Center (SAC) instructional component consisted of the reading and mathematics core designed to improve pupil achievement in these two areas.

The reading/language component provided intensive instruction for the improvement of skills in reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

The mathematics component presented fundamentals of mathematics and provided for understanding of certain mathematical ideas; it also developed reading skills necessary for the understanding of mathematics as it is utilized in everyday living and in the pursuit of advanced education.

The pupils assigned to the core were able underachievers; they were pupils of average or above-average ability who had been achieving two or more years below their grade level.

Black pupils accounted for 61% of the ESEA enrollment this year, brown, 37%, and other ethnic groups 2% (Tables 52 and 53), compared to 64%, 34%, and 2%, respectively, last year.

Each participating SAC school had a compensatory education coordinator (CEC) who was selected for the Program for Administrative Candidate Training (PACT). The CEC was in charge of the ESEA component. Each school also had a full-time SAC counselor. Each class had a teacher, specializing in the component subject, and the services of an education aide. In each SAC school one teacher was selected to be the reading coordinator and one to be the mathematics coordinator. School SAC offices were staffed by intermediate clerks and clerk typists serving the ESEA personnel. In addition, the SAC schools shared the services of consulting counselors, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) counselors, health teams, and area consultants and coordinators.

Pupils attended a reading/language class and a mathematics class daily for an average of 50 minutes per class. Class size was limited to 20 pupils. The classes were conducted from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971, except for the two-week Christmas holidays and the one-week spring vacation. Comparison pupils were enrolled in regular District English and mathematics classes and were matched to ESEA pupils by ethnicity, grade, IQ, achievement, and school neighborhood.

Pupils enrolled in the reading and mathematics core received individual tutoring facilitated by a full-time teacher aide working with the regular teacher in each class. Some of the teachers and aides were trained to use prescriptive teaching, the major instructional technique in the core. Prescriptive teaching consists of diagnosing or studying the needs of each pupil and then prescribing (or preparing) and applying instruction to meet those individual needs.

Experimental commercial study kits, skills books, and independent readers, as well as teacher-made materials, were used to individualize instruction.

All ESEA pupils were interviewed during the school year by SAC counselors. Records were maintained of all such counseling as well as of health services rendered. (See the Auxiliary Services report.) Counseling, psyshological and health services, intergroup relations activities, and parental involvement were used to support the achievement component.

Some workshops were conducted for aides, teachers, and counselors in the program to assist them in attainment of the objectives.

The major goal of the reading and mathematics core was to raise the median achievement level of the project participants by 10 grade-norm months in 8 months in both reading and mathematics, as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Standardized achievement tests, Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), in reading, language, and arithmetic were administered in October, 1970 (pre) and in May, 1971 (post) to all ESEA classes and to selected non-ESEA comparison classes. Form R2 of the CTBS was administered to junior high ESEA and comparison classes, Form R3 to similar senior high classes. There were eight months of instruction between pre- and posttesting. In addition to the CTBS standardized tests, attainment of the component's objective was evaluated at year-end by pupil, staff, and parent ratings. Also, analysis was made of SAC pupil retention and SAC staff preparation.

An analysis of covariance, using I.Q. as a covariant, showed that in seven of the eight CTBS subtests ESEA junior high pupils made significantly greater gains than did comparison pupils: at the .01 level in reading comprehension, arithmetic computation and concepts; at the .05 level in reading vocabulary, language mechanics and expression, and arithmetic application. Only in language/spelling was there no significant difference (Table 52). Last year, 1969-70, ESEA pupils made significantly greater gains in only two CTBS subtests, comparison pupils, in one subtest.

Junior high black pupils made significantly greater gains than did the black comparison pupils in six of the eight CTBS subtests (Table 54). There was no significant difference in the other two subtests. In the previous year ESEA pupils made a significantly greater gain in only one subtest.

Junior high brown pupils made significantly greater gains than did the brown comparison pupils in three of the eight subtests (Table 56). There were no significant differences on the other five subtests. Although last year brown pupils made greater gains than black pupils, the reverse was true this year.

Senior high pupils made greater grade-norm gains than did the junior high pupils but so did the senior high comparison pupils; thus, there were no significant differences between the senior high ESEA and comparison groups (Tables 53, 55, 57, and 64). The mean grade-norm gains on all CTBS subtests combined was five months for junior high pupils and seven months for senior high. The objective called for 10 months' growth during eight months of instruction.

The grade-norm gains this year exceeded those of last year. These gains may be attributable to several factors: this school year was uninterrupted whereas four weeks of instruction were lost due to the teachers' strike, in spring 1969; the on-going staff had more SAC experience; continuing SAC pupils had greater cumulative learning; and the use of a lower level of the CTBS this year may have reduced pupil frustration during testing.

Test administrators reported that some pupils were observed marking CTBS answer sheets randomly. To determine the influence of chance or random responses on the overall results, a special test was applied (Tables 58-63). Analysis of covariance Tables 58 through 63 parallel Tables 52 through 57 with one exception; in tables 58-63, all pupils whose scores were at or below the chance level calculated on CTBS publisher norms, were not used in the analyses.

Of the ESEA pupils who took both the pre- and posttests of the CTBS, approximately 85% scored above chance expectations in reading; 92%, in language; and 94%, in arithmetic. In five of the six sets of tables compared, the ESEA pupils who scored above chance had higher grade equivalent (GE) gains. The mean GE gain of Tables 52-59 was 6.2; the mean GE gain for Tables 58-63 (above-chance only) was 6.3; thus, the ESEA pupils who scored above chance level had an additional gain of only one-tenth of a grade-norm month.

At the end of the school year there were 4859 pupils in the SAC program. Of these, 4221 (86%) took at least one or more of the post subtests, and 3554 (73%) took both pre- and posttest of one or more of the CTBS subtests. There were 3356 (69%) pupils who took at least one of the subtests pre and post and who scored above chance; thus, by year end, 31% of the ESEA pupils either scored at or below chance level or failed to take more than one of the subtests.

The component's stated performance objective was to achieve 10 grade-norm months in 8 months of instruction. Table 65 shows the percentage of pupils who took both the pre- and posttest and who gained 10 or more months. On individual subtests of the CTBS, pupils who attained 10 or more months of gain ranged from a low of 29% of the seventh-graders in vocabulary (Table 65), to a high of 50% of the eighth-graders in language mechanics and ninth-graders in arithmetic concepts. Mean percentages of all eight subtests showed that 39% of the seventh-graders met the performance objective, 42% of eighth, 43% of ninth, and 40% of tenth. The percentages exceeded those of last year in nearly every subtest and grade.

An analysis of pupils' year-end grade placement, based on post CTBS scores (Table 66), showed that some pupils reached their grade level and, therefore, might qualify to return to regular classes in 1971-72. The greatest percentages of those reaching their grade levels this year, as was true last year, were among pupils who took both the pre- and posttest in language mechanics. Twenty-five percent of the seventh-graders, 33% of eighth, 38% of ninth, and 22% of tenth graders attained or surpassed their grade level by May 1971. This shows considerable progress; last year the language mechanics percentages for grades 7, 8, and 9 were 13%, 16%, and 14%, respectively.

Of the pupils who took complete tests pre and post, the following percentages reached their grade level:

Test, 1970-71	Grade 7	8	9	10	Raw Average
Reading	34%	41%	41%	41%	39%
Language	31%	37%	37%	40%	36%
Arithmetic	35%	36%	36%	35%	36%
Complete battery	4%	3%	2%	9%	5%

Academically, many of these pupils, if not all, are qualified to be returned to regular classes.

The SFP evaluation staff provided the SAC school staffs and the central office staff with computer printouts of pre and post CTBS results, arranged by individual pupil and by teacher; these may be used as additional input for the process of prescriptive teaching. Also, printouts were furnished which gave the longitudinal information of all CTBS tests taken by each pupil in SAC for the period between September 1969 and June 1971; these printouts allow the staff to see individual progress over a two-year period. In addition, gummed labels with CTBS test results for individual pupils were provided each of the SAC schools for both pre- and posttests.

An anlaysis of pupil transiency (chart below) showed that of the 4,885 SAC pupils enrolled in the 17 SAC schools the first school month, 79% were still in the program at the end of the school year. For the 30,639 non-SAC pupils in the same 17 schools only 71% were still in their school in June, 1971. It would appear that SAC classes had an 8% greater holding power than the regular classes.

17 SAC Schools' Enrollment, 1970-71

Pupils	9-70 Enrolled	No. Left	% Loss
SAC	4,885	1,043	21%
Non-SAC	30,639	8,912	29%

Personnel records of 89 of the 131 certificated SAC staff members (69%) were analyzed for trends; records for the other 31% were unavailable. Of those 89 staff members, 70% met the District ESEA guideline that certificated SAC staff must be composed of successful, tenured or probationary II or III teachers. The remaining 30% of the staff members were probationary I, substitutes, interns, and others (Table 83).

Females comprised 64% of the SAC certificated staff. Age distribution showed 42% of all staff to be under 30 years of age, and 8% over 50. In the category of ethnicity, black and brown teachers accounted for 34%. Over 74% had a bachelor's degree. Analysis of years of experience showed that the following percentages of teachers had worked less than six years in: teaching, 53%; the District, 70%; and their present position, 77%. Of the SAC staff analyzed, only 20% had prior experience in teaching English, and 7%, in teaching mathematics.

Pre-post ratings of prescriptive teaching (Form 101F) showed that gains were very small on the basis of either self-rating by teachers and aides, or by CEC rating of teachers and aides (Table 80). The total ratings were so close that the differences were not tested for statistical significance.

Comments were returned with the rating forms. In regard to workshops, typical comments were: "I know of non, . . . have been very few, . . . none have been scheduled." Median ratings on workshop attendance were about 3.0 on a 1-5, never-always scale. Total median ratings for all questions on Form 101F clustered around 4.0 — Usually.

Compensatory education coordinators were rated by the SAC staff, pre in November 1970 and post in May 1971 on their administrative skills (Form 101E). On a 1-5, poor-excellent scale, (Table 81) the highest post ratings given CECs were for dedication to ESEA (4.6); working well with staff, knowledge of program, and conducting meetings scored at 4.3; the lowest ratings were for effort to stimulate improved teaching, handling personnel problems, guiding the counseling program (4.0), and keeping the faculty aware of the ESEA program (3.9).

The greatest gains from pre to post evaluation appeared in ratings on use of test results and on comprehensive knowledge of program. The CECs regressed on ratings for meeting deadlines and on keeping the faculty aware of the ESEA program.

Highest post rating for all 15 items were given by principals (4.6), vice principals (4.5), and CECs themselves (4.5). The lowest post ratings were from Aides III (3.9), and certificated staff (3.7).

Ratings of CECs by their own school staffs showed a post median for all 15 items ranging from a high of 4.8 to a low of 2.8. The overall gain or loss from pre to post ranged from a high gain of .6 to a loss of -1.7 (Table 82).

At the request of the CECs the regular year-end SAC Program Evaluation form (Form 101G) was enlarged to allow all staff members to rate and to be rated. This questionnaire was distributed to all SAC personnel, local and zone. Of the 360 staff members who were sent the evaluation questionnaire, 148 (41%) responded. Of these, 14% of the central staff, 18% of the school administrators, 29% of the zone staff, 33% of the education aides, and 44% of the classified staff returned their forms. Largest returns came from 55% of the SAC teachers, 58% of the auxiliary services staff, and 82% of the CECs.

The generally light response was judged to be due in part to the length of the questionnaire and, judging by comments, to low morale of the SAC staffs. Ratings were on a 1-5, strongly disagree-strongly agree scale. No ratings of 1 or 5 were recorded. Most ratings were in the neutral (3) range. This lack of positiveness was exemplified by a median rating of 3.3 for staff development; possibly this indicated insufficient knowledge about inservice or that inservice activities were severely curtailed or nonexistent (Table 85).

A summary of responses (items A through J on Form 101G) follows:

A. Should specific periods for teaching, coordinating, and preparation be specified for the reading and arithmetic coordinators?

   Knowledge of the purposes for reading and mathematics coordinators seems generally lacking. No clear cut pattern emerges.

B. What ESEA-1 supportive staff should be furnished by each zone, and what should be their duties?

   Need expressed for help, particularly in intergroup activities and prescriptive teaching. Central office source deemed better than zones.

C. Please comment on the inservice and support your staff have received for prescriptive teaching.

Most respondents said they received little or no prescriptive teaching inservice. A few felt their individual school had adequate to good inservice. The 1970 summer workshop was praised.

D. Does your school program have a common conference period for SAC teachers and aides?

All agreed with the value of common conference periods for SAC staff, but most schools did not have them.

E. Who should be responsible for the mandated staff development (inservice) component?

Responsibility for inservice was generally placed with the central office staff except for the training of reading and mathematics; there the prime responsibility was placed with the reading and mathematics coordinators in the individual school.

F. Please comment on the degree to which local school administrators are informed about the SAC program and are supportive of it.

Most SAC staffs felt that the school administration was knowledgeable and supportive of SAC, but some felt there was little interest or support from administration.

G. Please comment on the selection and training of SAC classified staff.

Most felt that the selection of SAC classified staff was efficiently made, that more on-the-job inservice was needed, and that the classified staff was a part of the SAC team.

H. What recommendations would you make for selecting and retaining qualified SAC teachers?

Suggestions included recruiting city-wide; setting higher standards of selection; emphasizing advantages; allowing SAC teachers a part in aide-selection; giving excellent inservice training, more staff support, more psychological and financial rewards, and better promotional opportunities for outstanding SAC teachers.

I. How effective has been the team approach for helping SAC pupils in the auxiliary services component?

Most approved the team-approach theory where it had existed, but some had never heard of this part of the SAC program. Most favorable mention was of the services of the nurse and PSA counselor. More school time was desired for supportive services.

J. Describe your primary role and duties. What changes do you recommend?

1. CECs wrote that the CEC should devote his full time to SAC, give more leadership in instructional inservice, and clarify the CEC's position as an administrative intern.

2. SAC counselors felt need for more help, e.g., counseling intern and additional clerical time.

3. Clerical staff generally indicated job satisfaction; some urged shorter hours, overtime pay, freedom to be on parent advisory committees, and more opportunity to work with pupils.

4. Education Aides III requested reduction in clerical tasks in order to devote more time to pupils; they suggested that more care be taken in harmoniously matching teacher and aide; they want more inservice, more specific guidelines for aide services, and improved hours and pay.

5. Reading and mathematics coordinators felt a need for more conference time, more inservice, and more support from administration.

6. SAC teachers wanted more preparation time; more parent contact; more and better instructional materials; more voice in policy making, inservice, assignment of average underachievers, and transfer of the trouble makers; elimination of homeroom for SAC teachers; and better operating guidelines.

Forms for Pupil Evaluation of SAC (Form 101H) were distributed to two randomly selected SAC classes in each school. Of the 620 forms distributed, 613 (99%) were returned. Each pupil received an envelope with his questionnaire; upon completion of the evaluation he placed the form in the envelope and sealed it. As a result of this protection of privacy, 90% of the pupils returning questionnaires wrote comments which in quantity and quality were superior to their responses in previous years.

Pupils were asked to rate 15 statements on a 1-5, strongly disagree-strongly agree scale (Table 84). Highest agreement was on statements that better schoolwork is up to the pupil and that the pupil knows what kind of schoolwork he does best. Greatest disagreement was on the statements that "Someone from SAC came to my house" and "I'd like to be back in a regular English class." Black and brown pupils generally agreed that the aide gives a lot of help and that they were improving more in English and mathematics as a result of being in a SAC class.

Black pupils commented that they:

1. Liked best: field trips, small classes, good teachers, individual help, and nothing ("I hate it").

2. Disliked most: poor teaching, too much work, too easy work, "dumb classes," and separation from friends.

3. Would change: more field trips, teachers and CECs (some highly praised, some condemned), more aides, better materials and equipment, more interesting classes, transfer of troublemakers, and expansion of SAC to include other subjects.

Brown pupils commented that they:

1. Liked best: teachers and aides, smaller classes, field trips, improved learning, more individual help, and more fun.

2. Disliked most: concept that SAC kids are dumb, numerous tests, SRA, classes that are too easy, and lack of films.

3. Would change: other subjects added to SAC, more aides, more films, more field trips, and more library work.

Each school was asked to furnish names and addresses of SAC parents who had attended one or more scheduled school meetings. Nearly 550 Parent Questionnaires (Forms 102 A-B) were mailed; enclosed was a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of the form. Brown parents were sent 213 questionnaires—in Spanish and English—but returned only 11 (5%). Black parents were sent 368 forms; they returned 117 (32%). Thus of the total number of forms sent, only 127 (23%) were returned.

On a 1-5, strongly disagree-strongly agree scale, the parents most strongly agreed that their child "reads better this year than last" (4.4); this was followed closely by agreement that their children received better instruction, that their children should meet pupils of different ethnic or cultural background, that parents desired more community activity in ESEA, and that parents found aides helpful (4.3). Parents disagreed that home visits had been made (2.1). (See Table 79).

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: The objective of gaining 10 grade-norm months in 8 months of instruction (between pre- and posttests) was partially achieved, in terms of subtest scores; however, average grade-norm gains for junior high pupils on all of the eight subtests this year exceeded those reported last year (Table 64).

The tenth-grade pupils made greater grade-norm gains than did the junior high pupils; however, it is noteworthy that the tenth-grade ESEA pupils' gains were not significantly different than those of the tenth-grade comparison pupils. Although causes for this lack of significant ESEA achievement cannot be pinpointed, mention should be made of organizational problems in the two senior high schools, which reentered the program after one year of non-participation. The tenth-graders will possibly reflect their accumulated SAC experience when evaluated in the coming year as eleventh-graders.

Teachers and pupils both commented on the desirability of removing pupils who did not try to achieve and who impeded full achievement of their classmates. As noted earlier, 1503 pupils (39%) either scored at or below chance on the CTBS or failed to take more than one of the subtests.

Thus, a more careful screening of able underachievers would eliminate those whose physical or psychological problems not only prevent them from learning

but hinder others who do have the potential to learn; this screening probably would allow higher goals to be achieved.

At year's end the ESEA program had retained 79% of the pupils enrolled the first school month while only 71% of non-ESEA pupils remained.

This year, unlike last year, no teacher-made nonstandardized tests were submitted for evaluation. Administrative guidance is needed to encourage the development of these nonstandardized tests so that process evaluation and feedback will be possible.

Personnel records (Table 83) indicated that guidelines for teacher selection were not met. Careful adherence to these guidelines and selection of a staff more knowledgeable in reading and arithmetic skills, plus aggressive inservice, would probably result in higher pupil achievement through better instruction.

Although all ESEA teachers and aides were to receive inservice instruction in prescriptive teaching, planned inservice on the zone and local level was either lacking or unevenly administered. Staff response indicated that the inservice was inferior to that of the previous year. Better planning and administration of inservice are needed on both the zone and local level. ESEA teachers and aides need intensive inservice in prescriptive teaching and increased motivation to use it.

Teachers, aides, and other staff personnel need central office leadership in inservice. Development of classroom materials is necessary for prescriptive teaching so that this mandated technique can be successfully used by the teaching staff, and can be understood by consultants and administrative staff.

Pre and post ratings of CECs showed no gains, indicating no benefit from inservice training. The CECs need clarification of their position as administrative interns and restriction of their use for non-ESEA purposes.

Pupils' confidential responses to questionnaires showed that most of them approved the SAC program, but many had complaints and suggestions. The pupil comments should be studied for clues to possible program improvement.

According to questionnaire responses, administrators, staff, pupils, and parents generally approved the program. Parents indicated a desire for more intergroup activity and more community involvement in ESEA. Pupils would like other subjects included in SAC, more field trips, and removal of troublemakers from SAC.

AUXILIARY SERVICES

Abstract

Pupils	4859
Schools	17
Senior High 2	
Junior High 15	
Counselors	21
Consulting Counselors	4
PSA workers	5
Doctors	3
Nurses	4
Cost budgeted	$327,112

DESCRIPTION: The auxiliary services component was designed to support the instructional component. Student Achievement Center (SAC) counselors, consulting counselors, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) workers, nurses, doctors, and dentists were assigned to specific schools as teams to provide concentrated, individualized, and comprehensive service to project pupils and parents. They gave counseling and guidance, and they helped to identify project pupils in need of medical and/or dental treatment. Counselors, nurses, and PSA workers consulted with school staffs and agency workers. Additionally, PSA workers made many home calls. Project pupils in need of health services were referred to visiting school doctors and dentists.

TIME INTERVALS: This component operated from mid-September 1970 through June 1971. Counselors saw counselees individually and in groups. Many counselees were seen weekly or more often, as needed. PSA workers involved pupils in individual and family counseling, often in the home setting. Continuous health and dental services were rendered to project pupils throughout the school year.

ACTIVITIES: Individually and in groups, project pupils talked to counselors and PSA workers: they had conferences with nurses to set up appointments with doctors, dentists, and other practitioners. Counselors, PSA workers, and nurses also consulted with school staffs, kept record of contacts, developed individualized pupil instructional plans, and reviewed pupils' records.

Project pupils who had not had a physical examination in the past two years, and pupils with identified defects received the first appointments with doctors. Treatment was prescribed throughout the school year.

OBJECTIVES: (Counseling)

project participants will demonstrate knowledge of their educational strengths and weaknesses, and will show acceptance of responsibility for remedying those weaknesses, as indicated by no significant differences on appropriate, locally devised rating scales completed in October 1970 and April 1971 by randomly selected pupils, their English and mathematics teachers, and their counselor; and

(Health) by the end of May 1971, each project participant who has not received a physical examination within two years will have received a complete physical examination by a medical doctor, and appropriate recommendations will have been made for correction and follow-up of all defects discovered. Records will be kept of all defects found and corrected.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Project pupils were compared to non-ESEA pupils in their own schools on an attitude scale given pre and post. Project pupils also were asked to rate their academic strengths and weaknesses and these were compared to ratings of the same dimensions by pupils' reading and math teachers, and by their counselors.

At year-end, project participants provided program rating through questionnaires and added open-end comments.

RESULTS: Project counselors held 10,082 individual and 1182 group counseling sessions, more than 3600 guidance meetings, and more than 2700 intake interviews with project pupils. Counselor records also indicated nearly 34,000 conferences with school staffs and parents.

PSA workers had case loads involving 346 project pupils.

Nurses reported conferences with 7852 pupils, 3648 parents, and 6900 staff personnel. In addition, their efforts facilitated the examinations of nearly 90% of project pupils needing this service, as well as the correction of 55% of pupil defects detected.

Significant pre-post differences existed among pupil, teachers, and counselor ratings of pupil abilities to function effectively in the classroom. Pupils tended to rate their abilities lower than did staff personnel.

Pupil scores on a locally devised attitude scale, the Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC), indicated significant growth by the ESEA group on 3 of 10 concepts while the comparison group showed one negative and no positive results.

Parent, pupil, and staff responses to questionnaires indicated an overwhelming number of positive ratings of program features. Pupils and staff were undecided about PSA services; pupils and parents were unsure of health services; staff ratings of the nurse's help were positive, but staff ratings on the rest of the health team were neutral.

Open-end comments by pupils and parents substantiated positive regard for the program; there were a few negative comments by pupils, and certain concerns were voiced by parents about involving more parents in SAC activities. Generally, staff comments were similarly positive, but project counselors suggested more adequate facilities, more clerical assistance, and expansion of time and personnel. Nurses also expressed a need for more time.

CONCLUSIONS: Project pupils did not rate themselves as strongly as did their teachers and counselors on skills needed to function effectively in a classroom; this indicated that the counseling objective may have been only minimally attained. QMOC attitudinal data showed positive statistical advances by ESEA pupils while the comparison group indicated some regression.

Nearly 90% of the pupils who needed physical examinations received them. Project staff held numerous conferences with pupils, parents, staff, and others. Program ratings by pupils, parents, and staff were positive except in the area of PSA and some health aspects. Open-end comments supported positive ratings although certain shortcomings were forwarded by staff members.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Counseling services should be continued and expanded where needed. Group counseling should continue to be developed, and its use should be explored in schools not using this technique. Additional clerical assistance should be provided for counselors.

The PSA worker's role should be altered so that he would become a more effective member of the auxiliary services team.

Health services should be continued and, if possible, expanded.

AUXILIARY SERVICES

Detailed Report

In the counseling and Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) components, Student Achievement Center (SAC) counselors, consulting counselors, and PSA workers were assigned to specific schools to provide guidance and counseling to project pupils and parents. Counselors and PSA workers also consulted with school staffs and agency workers. PSA workers involved pupils in individual and family counseling, often in the home.

All project pupils were advised and/or counseled by project counselors at least twice during the school year. Many were seen weekly or more often, as necessary. Selected pupils were counseled in groups and individually on a regular basis in certain schools.

Registered nurses were assigned to specific schools to help in identifying project pupils in need of medical and/or dental treatment. Pupils in need of such treatment were referred to visiting school doctors and dentists.

Project nurses attempted to see all project pupils at least once during the school year; complete examinations were scheduled for pupils who had not had one in the past two years.

A counselor in each of the 17 junior and senior high target schools provided counseling and guidance to project pupils. Four target schools were also assigned an additional counselor. Four consulting and five PSA workers were given assignments to serve in the 17 schools. Three of the four counselors served four schools; one served five schools. PSA personnel were assigned to work in two to five schools; those with fewer secondary schools to serve had additional elementary school responsibilities.

Four project nurses, doctors, and dentists worked together as teams to identify pupils in need of treatment for medical and dental defects. Nurses also had conferences with pupils and school staffs, and kept records of all such contacts. This school year, the team tried to focus its attention on youngsters who had not had a complete physical examination within the past two years.

Project counselors, consulting counselors, PSA workers, nurses, doctors, and dentists kept monthly records of contacts with project pupils and parents. Services were rated by pupils, parents, and project personnel at year-end, and open-end comments were also collected. Project pupils were compared to non-ESEA pupils in their own schools on an attitude scale given pre and post. Project pupils also were asked to rate pre and post their academic strengths and weaknesses; these were rated pre and post also by the pupils' reading teachers, math teachers, and counselors.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Project counselors and PSA workers attempted to diagnose pupils' academic strengths and weaknesses through individual and group counseling contacts. Counselors met with school staffs and parents,

maintained and reviewed pupil records, programmed pupils, gave tests, and facilitated referrals. Counselor records (Table 67) showed 10,082 individual contacts, 1182 group meetings, and 1908 sessions for pupil appraisals. Records also indicated nearly 34,000 consultations with school staffs and parents, more than 3600 guidance conferences, and more than 2700 intake interviews.

PSA workers also met with school personnel and parents, made necessary home calls, initiated referrals, and kept record of contacts. Their logs (Table 77) indicated case loads involving 346 pupils. Attempts were made to improve pupils' academic skills and their attitudes about themselves, others, and the environment.

A rating instrument, the Counseling Profile, was administered pre and post to randomly selected pupils in eight randomly selected schools, four of which were black and four, brown. This locally-devised instrument was intended to determine how closely the pupil, his math and English teachers, and his counselor would agree on the pupil's ability to function effectively in a classrom; it was intended also to determine the degree of responsibility assumed by each staff member for remedying any deficiencies the pupil might have. Areas rated included academic skills, personality traits, and responsibility tasks.

A comparison of pre-post mean differences (Table 68) revealed that among the four brown groups the pupils' profiles showed only one statistically significant positive result that agreed with one other rater. This rater, the counselor, rated all items positively (statistically significant) from pre to post. In addition, the counselor agreed on seven items with the reading teacher but on none with the math teacher. The math teacher indicated eight statistically significant negative ratings and agreed in one instance with the pupil who showed two such results. It appeared that the typical brown pupil and his math teacher agreed (negatively); the reading teacher and counselor agreed (positively) with each other but not with the pupil or math teacher. Items of agreement seemed to deal mainly with academic content, two dealt with personality traits, and one, with responsibility tasks.

Black groups (Table 69) indicated stronger agreement than brown on areas rated. Three of the four groups were in statistically significant, positive agreement on six items and in complete agreement on one. All but one significantly rated item dealt with academic skills (Table 69).

Black pupils were in significant positive agreement with their counselors, reading teachers, and math teachers in six areas. Teachers agreed with each other on six items and with the counselor on nine items.

Combined results (Table 70) for all groups showed pupils agreeing with the reading teachers and counselors on two items; the counselors were significantly positive on all items. Counselors aligned with the reading teachers on ten items, and with math teachers on four. The area in which most raters agreed significantly was academic skills. Staff personnel, especially the counselor, seemed to rate pupil changes (pre to post) more significantly and positively than did the pupil himself. The most conservative staff personnel rater was the math teacher whose rating profile resembled the pupil's most closely.

An attitude scale, the Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC), was administered pre and post to selected project pupils. A shift of mean was interpreted as noteworthy if the post mean moved one point minus or plus from the pre mean, based on standard errors collected on QMOC data for the past three years.

Only one of the post means for the black experimental group (Table 71) was significant, although one other noteworthy change in post mean was observed. Both of these ("My Best Friends," and "Most People,") positive changes were directed at others in one's environment. The comparison black group exhibited only one significant change in attitude; it was negative ("My School").

The brown ESEA group (Table 72) showed six noteworthy changes in post means, four positive and two negative. The four positives were statistically significant; one of the negatives was. The positives dealt with the qualities of self and others, while the negatives were directed toward teachers and school. The brown comparison group showed two negative changes in post means which paralleled responses of the ESEA group.

The combined results of all ESEA and comparison groups (Table 73) found the ESEA group to be significantly positive on concepts about self and others, while the comparison group was significant, and negative, on the concept "My School."

The black high school ESEA group (Table 74) showed five noteworthy changes in post means, four positive and one negative. Its comparison group exhibited seven noteworthy changes in post means, four negative and three positive. Both groups indicated positive noteworthy agreement on the concepts "My Classmates" and "Counselors."

Brown high school QMOC data were not submitted.

All ESEA groups showed more positive advances in their attitudes suggesting that they had alleviated more of the obstacles to learning than their comparison counterparts.

According to physicians' reports (Table 75), 4290 pupils were given physical examinations; in other words, 88% of the pupils needing examinations received such attention.

In addition. doctors gave 1623 of these same pupils reexaminations. The most prevalent defect found was dental caries, three times as frequent as the next most prevalent defect, faulty vision.

Nurses' records (Table 76) showed conferences with 7852 pupils, 3648 parents, and 6900 school staff members. There were also 2806 contacts with pupils who had defects detected; of these 1554 (55%) were corrected. Project counselors, consulting counselors, and PSA workers also held an undetermined number of conferences on health problems and related concerns.

Pupils indicated, by their responses to a questionnaire (Table 84), that they felt the counseling which they had received was helpful, but they questioned the quality of PSA services. All parents who responded to a questionnaire designed for them (Table 79), gave similar responses.

SAC staff personnel, submitting ratings on the effectiveness of the SAC program (Table 85) reflected higher positive regard for counseling services than for PSA. Pupils' and parents' ratings of health and dental services were somewhat neutral; staff judgments were positive in terms of the nurses' help and neutral toward the rest of the health team.

Pupils' open-end comments indicated high positive regard for program features. The following comments were typical:

I like the trips. (98)
It's a better and smaller class and you learn much faster. (32)
I get more help. (18)
But I like the counselor best of all. (11)

Negative feelings were reflected in a general comment:

I hate SAC. (19)

Open-end comments by parents substantiated pupils' ratings and provided suggestions for improving the program. The following thoughts were voiced by several parents:

Write and call parents to let them know how important the program is.
Have parents feel they are needed and wanted.
Try to get kids to involve their parents in the program and vice versa.

Staff comments were highly positive of general program features, but the following concerns and needs were expressed:

There is a real lack of adequate facilities.
The supportive services team needs more time together to coordinate their efforts.
As enrollments increase so should the number of counselors.
Provide more clerical help.
The health team members need to have more time to get together and to communicate with one another.
More time is needed by the nurse for follow-up of pupils with defects detected.

Project pupils did not rate themselves as positively as did their teachers and counselor on skills needed to function effectively in a classroom. QMOC attitudinal data reflected positive statistical advances in the ESEA group compared to its comparison groups.

Counselors, PSA workers, and nurses held numerous conferences with pupils, parents, staff, and others. Program ratings by pupils, parents, and staff were positive except in the area of PSA service. Comments by all three groups supported positive ratings.

Nearly 90% of pupils needing physical examinations received this service. Nurses held many conferences with pupils, parents, staff, and others. Pupil and parent ratings of health services were somewhat neutral; staff ratings were also neutral except in the area of nursing.

Comments from participants were positive but certain lacks were defined by staff personnel.

Counseling services should be continued and a second counselor assigned to schools with high ESEA enrollment. Group counseling should be continued and expanded in schools presently using the technique. Schools not using it should initiate it with help from central offices.

Clerical tasks which must be performed over long periods, should be assigned to clerical staffs; more clerks should be added, if needed.

The PSA worker's role should be altered so that he would become a more effective member of the supportive services team.

There should be an increase in the number of nurses, providing services in this component.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Abstract

Pupils		4859
Schools		17
Senior Highs	2	
Junior Highs	15	
Staff		259
Cost budgeted		$213,526

DESCRIPTION: The intergroup relations component was designed to improve attitudes and problem-solving approaches in human relations. It involved ESEA pupils, parents, and staff. Activities were planned and organized by some of the compensatory education coordinators for both students and adults.

TIME INTERVALS: ESEA schools individually scheduled their activities during the school year.

ACTIVITIES: Pupil multicultural activities included one Black History Week morning program and "Young Soul" stage productions, both of which were District-funded. A class from one ESEA school spent a week in Hawaii; this was funded by school events and parents. Some ESEA schools had class exchange visits with non-ESEA schools of other ethnic and cultural backgrounds; these visits were funded by ESEA.

OBJECTIVES: The major goals of the intergroup relations component were that

on a locally devised measure of intergroup awareness (IMOC) 70% of the participating pupils will improve their posttest scores on 6 of 12 concepts by 1.0 or more; and

at least 90% of project participants will attend and rate in a positive manner three of the specially planned intergroup events, showing their positive feelings toward intergroup relations, as measured by a locally devised rating scale.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: A locally devised semantic differential attitude test, the Intergroup Measure of Concepts (IMOC), was designed to measure pupil changes in attitude. It was furnished to Student Achievement Center (SAC) schools and their non-SAC exchange schools for pre and post administration, that is, prior to the first contact between groups and after the last contact. The non-SAC pupils were different from the SAC pupils in ethnicity and socio-economic background.

Since no intergroup relations inservice was offered, no evaluation was possible.

Black History Week and "Young Soul" events were given for large groups of SAC and non-SAC pupils. The size of the groups and lack of prior knowledge of whom would be present, made evaluation impractical.

RESULTS: The Hawaii group and the one SAC school that successfully completed exchange visits with a non-SAC school, showed noteworthy positive and negative shifts on the IMOC. None of the groups made noteworthy improvement on as many, as six of the concepts on the IMOC.

The first objective called for 70% of the participating pupils to improve their posttest scores on six or more IMOC concepts. Since only 8% of the participating pupils were involved in taking the IMOC and none of them improved on six or more IMOC concepts, this objective was not met.

The second objective called for 90% of the project participants to attend and rate three intergroup events. No students were known to have attended three intergroup events; fewer than 8% were known to have attended any; therefore, this objective also was not met.

CONCLUSIONS: This mandated component was neglected; its objectives were not achieved.

No workshops were held to train ESEA staffs in intergroup relations and no central or zone office personnel were assigned to aid in facilitating the component.

The few pupils and staff who participated indicated approval of the component. Parents urged its implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Central office and area administration should give support and guidance to the component so that every SAC participant is involved in intergroup relations, as required.

Planned inservice in intergroup relations should be conducted so that all SAC schools may have equal opportunity and motivation to successfully implement this mandated component.

In the interest of improved services to ESEA pupils, it is suggested that a self-imposed system be established to monitor adherence to federal, state, and District guidelines for meeting component requirements and objectives, including monthly reports to central, area, and evaluation offices.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Detailed Report

The intergroup relations component was designed to improve attitudes and problem-solving approaches in human relations. It involved ESEA pupils, parents, and staff. Activities were planned and organized by some of the compensatory education coordinators for both students and adults.

This component was implemented in part in 15 junior and two senior high schools for 4859 ESEA pupils. The ESEA funds encumbered amounted to $213,526 or $44 per pupil.

ESEA schools individually scheduled their activities during the school year.

Intergroup relations activities included a District-funded Black History Week program, presented the morning of February 20, at Trade Technical College, and open to all students in the District; a District-funded "Young Soul" stage production, given at several schools; a week in Hawaii, enjoyed by one class from one ESEA school, students accompanied by parents, and funds raised through special school events and parental contributions; and ESEA-funded class visit exchanges between Student Achievement Center (SAC) and non-SAC schools.

The locally devised semantic differential attitude test, Intergroup Measure of Concepts (IMOC), was designed to measure pupil changes in attitude. It was furnished to SAC schools and their non-SAC exchange schools for pre and post administration, that is, before the first contact between groups and after the last contact. The non-SAC pupils were different from the SAC pupils in ethnicity and socio-economic background.

The short-term Black History Week and "Young Soul" events were given for SAC and non-SAC pupils. The large size of the groups and the lack of prior knowledge of whom would be present, made evaluation impractical.

The SAC students who had the week in Hawaii took the IMOC test immediately before and following the trip.

Of the 17 SAC schools, only one successfully completed exchange visits with a non-SAC school, correctly using the IMOC pre and post. Seven other SAC schools (41%) partially completed their exchange visits and evaluation. The remaining nine SAC schools (53%) did not participate in exchange visits.

Neutral responses on a concept of the IMOC would yield a mean score of 30.0. All IMOC scores pre and post were above 30.0, or on the positive side. A shift of a mean on the IMOC was interpreted as noteworthy if the post mean moved one point minus or plus from the pre mean.

In the group which went to Hawaii, such noteworthy shifts occurred in more than half of the concepts. Positive movement was shown for concepts "Myself," "My Culture," and "Anglos"; negative, for "Mexican Americans", "Afro-Americans", "My Neighborhood", and "My Freedom" (Table 78).

The ESEA school-exchange groups had four noteworthy changes moving negatively for concepts "My Country" and "My Neighborhood"; positively, for "Mexican Americans" and "Anglos." The latter was statistically significant at the .01 level.

The comparison groups had no positive responses but two negative for "My Education" and "My Future." These were statistically significant at the .05 level.

The first objective stated that 70% of the participating pupils should improve their posttest scores on six or more IMOC concepts. Of the total 4892 SAC pupils, only 250 took part in school exchange visits, and 20 made the trip to Hawaii. This means only 8% of the students participated in intergroup relations activities. Only 114 pupils (42% of the 270 participants) completed the pre-post IMOC, and these fell short of positive scores on six concepts. This objective, therefore, was not met.

The second objective called for 90% of the project participants (3843 pupils) to attend and rate three intergroup events. As noted above, only 8% of the project participants took part in school exchange visits. Additionally, a small number attended the "Young Soul" presentation and a Black History Week assembly. Thus, since no students were known to have attended three intergroup events, and only 8% were known to have attended less than three, this objective also was not met.

No workshops were held to train ESEA staffs in intergroup relations and no central or zone office personnel were assigned to aid in facilitating the component. In the SAC Program Evaluation (Form 101G), several staff members noted the lack of help in intergroup relations.

In response to their questionnaire (Forms 101 A-B), parents most strongly agreed that their children should meet pupils with different ethnic or cultural backgrounds (Table 79).

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: This mandated component was neglected; its objectives were not achieved.

The few pupils and staff who participated indicated approval of the component. Parents urged its implementation.

Central office and area administration should give support and guidance to the component so that every SAC participant is involved in intergroup relations, as required.

Planned inservice for the component should be conducted so that all SAC schools may have equal opportunity and motivation to successfully implement this mandated component.

In the interest of improved services to ESEA pupils, it is suggested that a self-imposed system be established to monitor adherence to federal, state, and District guidelines for meeting component requirements and objectives, including monthly reports to central, area, and evaluation offices.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Abstract

Parents		620
Schools		17
Senior High	2	
Junior High	15	
Cost budgeted		$200,373

DESCRIPTION: The parent involvement component was designed generally to support the instructional program, and specifically to improve communications between the school and community through cooperative action by the school staff and the District-funded home-school coordinator. Parents met in groups in their children's schools, in community locations, and at the District level to discuss Student Achievement Center (SAC) problems; they also were involved in field trips.

TIME INTERVALS: The component operated from mid-September 1970 through June 1971, interrupted only by the normal-school holidays and vacations. Parents usually met monthly or more frequently, as needed.

ACTIVITIES: Parents met with school staffs in discussion groups and cooperatively planned and implemented school events. Parents also worked with pupils, individually and in groups; they learned about the SAC program and how to use its materials, supplies, and equipment.

OBJECTIVES: The major goal of the Parent Involvement Component was that at least 50% of all parents of participating pupils will attend four or more group/individual meetings concerning the project and will rate these experiences in a positive manner, showing their support of the project, as measured by a locally devised scale and school records of parental attendance.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Compensatory education coordinators (CEC), counselors, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) workers, and nurses kept monthly records of contacts with parents. The SAC program was rated by pupils, parents, and staff, at year-end, and open-end comments were collected.

RESULTS: Pupil, parent, and staff responses on questionnaires designed for each of these three groups, provided ratings which generally endorsed program features; parents showed concern for program housing facilities.

Open-end comments by parents affirmed their ratings; ways to involve more parents in the program were proposed.

CECs' guest books contained 620 parents' names and addresses, although staff personnel records indicated more than 12,000 parent contacts.

CONCLUSIONS: A total of 620 parents (43% increase over last year) attended scheduled SAC parent events; this was below expectations, although more than 12,000 parents reportedly had conferences with SAC staffs.

Pupils, parents, and staff participants endorsed program features, however, parents expressed concern regarding involvement of more parents in the program. The component's objective was partially met.

RECOMMENDATIONS: This component should be continued and its activities expanded to involve more parents.

A systematic program of incentives for parent participation might be attempted on a pilot basis. A uniform method of recording parent attendance at events should be developed. Agendas planned for parent involvement events should be available for study.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Detailed Report

The parent involvement component was designed to support the instructional components and, specifically, to attempt to improve communications between school and community through cooperative action by the compensatory education coordinator (CEC), Student Achievement Center (SAC) counselor, District-funded home-school coordinator, community aide, and school principal. Parents met in groups in their children's schools, community locations, and at the District level to discuss SAC problems.

The component operated from mid September 1970 through June 1971. Parents usually met monthly or more often, as needed.

The principal, CEC, home-school coordinator, project counselor, and community aide worked cooperatively toward increasing parent participation in the SAC program. In each school, the personnel cited above stimulated parent interest by talking with parents and by inviting them to share in the planning of school events.

Parents met in SAC and principal's advisory groups on a monthly basis or more frequently, if necessary. Some also met in an organization at the District level. These groups planned and implemented fund-raising drives, supervised off-campus trips, helped teachers with routines in the classroom, provided guidance to pupils, tutored pupils, learned about the SAC program, and learned how to use its materials, supplies, and equipment.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: CEC's, counselors, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) workers, and nurses kept monthly records of contacts with parents. Parents and staff rated the component in terms of effectiveness at year-end, and open-end comments were collected.

CEC's asked parents who attended scheduled school events to sign guest books; from these, lists of names and addresses of attending parents were compiled. According to these records, 620 parents attended SAC events in the 17 project schools. Of these, 171 parents attended four or more school events; 449 attended three or less. In 1969-70, a total of 266 parents were reported as having been active in the component; this year, participation by 620 parents reflects an increase of 43% over last year.

Based on an estimate of one parent for each of 4892 project pupils, the 620 parents attending school events comprised 13% of all SAC parents; 171 parents (the number attending four or more events) was 3% of the total. It appeared that a select group of parents were attending and planning school events.

Twenty-one counselors, four consulting counselors, five PSA workers, and four project nurses kept a count of their contacts with parents (Tables 67, 76, 77). Counselors' records showed that they had talked with 4890 parents (2872 by phone); consulting counselors talked to 370 and nurses, to 3648 parents. Nurses' records did not indicate the number of phone contacts; consulting counselors' records listed 169 such communiques. PSA workers reported that they had talked with 496 parents.

Each project counselor averaged 245 parent contacts during the school year, compared to a nurse's average of 718, PSA worker's 99, and consulting counselor's 93. Nurses had nearly three times as many parent contacts as had project counselors, and more than seven times as many contacts as PSA workers and consulting counselors; this tally does not reflect factors, such as the quality or intensity of conferences.

To determine the effectiveness of the SAC program, questionnaires were sent to 550 SAC parents who had attended SAC events; questionnaires were distributed proportionately to black and brown parents. Only 11 of 117 responses were received from brown parents. Due to this disparity, analyses reflect the majority opinion which was collected from the predominantly black central ESEA areas.

There was strong agreement between the ratings of parents who attended four of more meetings and those of parents who attended three or less SAC activities (Table 79). The only observed disagreement between these groups regarded their child's receiving a recent physical examination at school. The group that attended more meetings rated this concern somewhat lower (3.0) than the other group (3.8). The combined ratings of all parents (3.7) aligned closely with the rating of the less active group. Combined ratings were also highly supportive of program features. The only area in which some concern was shown pertained to the adequacy of program housing.

Project pupils (Table 84) indicated by their ratings that their parents regarded the program positively except for the home visitation feature.

Project personnel (Table 85) agreed that parents were more interested in the program this year than last.

Parents expressed positive regard for the program and proposed the following suggestions for improving it:

> Write and call parents to let them know how important the program is.
> Have parents feel they are needed and wanted.
> Try to get kids to involve their parents in the program and vice versa.

Parent participants strongly endorsed the parent involvement component. Pupils and project staff agreed that parents regarded the program positively.

Project personnel held numerous conferences with parents; however, the number of parents who attended the SAC activities planned for them fell far below expectations. The activities of this component should be continued and should be expanded to involve more parents.

A systematic program of incentives for parent participation might be attempted on a pilot basis. A uniform method of recording parent attendance at events planned for them should be developed. Agendas which include SAC events which are planned for parents, should be made available for study.

The component's objective was partially met.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Abstract

Staff members	259
Cost budgeted	$93,000

DESCRIPTION: Zone reading and mathematics consultants visited individual classrooms and, based on their observations, gave individual inservice to the teacher and/or aide. Schools conducted formal or informal inservice meetings with staff members. Counselors had periodic group meetings with central office personnel or their representatives.

TIME INTERVALS: The component was funded to operate from September 1970 through mid-June 1971. Inservice meetings ranged in time from half-hour noon sessions to longer meetings of school and (SAC) staffs. Several counselors periodically led sensitivity training sessions for the office staff during the school year or on a bimonthly basis during the spring semester.

ACTIVITIES: Schools held inservice meetings on regular or irregular bases. Zone consultants gave inservice assistance on an individual basis. Compensatory education coordinators (CECs) met several times during the school year to receive information on timely administrative problems.

OBJECTIVES: The major goals of the staff development component were that

by February 1971 all classroom teachers and aides will have achieved a score of 90% or better on locally devised, separate rating lists of 20 prescriptive-teaching elements as rated by self and CEC;

all counselors will demonstrate their improved skills in identifying pupils' strengths and weaknesses in learning as determined by no difference among pupils, teachers, and counselor on separate instruments; and

by May 1971 all compensatory education coordinators will have achieved a score of 90% or higher on improved skills in the administration of the local ESEA Title I project, as rated by self and staff on a locally devised scale of approximately 20 essential qualities of successful project administration.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: At year-end staff members were asked to rate staff development and to make comments. Prescriptive teaching was rated pre and post in February and May. Counselors, teachers, and pupils rated counseling pre and post. Compensatory education coordinators were rated pre and post by self and staff.

RESULTS: Staff ratings of the staff development component were neutral; comments indicated that little or no inservice was offered. Results of the pre-post evaluation of the effects of inservice on prescriptive teaching showed that gains were small and statistically not significant. The objective was not attained.

The pre-post difference in rating the effect of inservice for CECs indicated that little change occurred. This objective also was not attained. The pre-post rating of counseling was inconsistent to the degree that it was concluded that the objective was only minimally attained.

CONCLUSIONS: With few exceptions, school workshops for reading and mathematics were not held on regular basis. Zone consultants reported that they conducted no inservice workshops and that they did not have any money with which to conduct them. As a compromise, they met informally with individuals or small groups.

No workshops were held for staff training in intergroup relations.

Counselors met periodically throughout the school year.

RECOMMENDATIONS: As the staff development component is mandated, it is recommended that ESEA project managers give area coordinators, SAC principals, and CECs appropriate directives and support for fulfilling the federal requirements that all personnel must participate in inservice, and that staff development must be planned as a series of ongoing activities, not as a one-time event.

Plans for the year's inservice for each component be submitted at the beginning of the school year by those responsible for conducting the training. Monthly notices of inservice meetings should be submitted one month prior to the workshop dates. The above plans and reports should be sent to the central, area, and evaluation offices.

Inservice should be planned for specific groups; content of training should be clearly defined to include the specific topics mandated by the federal guidelines.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Detailed Report

A sum of $93,000 was budgeted for staff development. This averaged $360 for inservice education for each of 259 ESEA staff members in the program.

The effects of inservice were measured by two methods: one asked for comments regarding quality and quantity of inservice; the other used rating scales administered by self and compensatory education coordinators (CECs) for teachers and aides, and by self and Student Achievement Center (SAC) staff for CECs.

Zone reading and mathematics consultants visited individual classrooms and, based on their observations, gave individual inservice to the teacher and/or aide. Schools conducted formal or informal inservice meetings with staff members. Counselors had periodic group meetings with central office personnel or their representatives.

Inservice meetings within schools ranged in time from half-hour lunch-time meetings to occasional SAC staff meetings. Several counselors met periodically with central office staff during the school year in sensitivity sessions or on a bimonthly basis in groups during the spring semester.

Schools held inservice meetings on regular or irregular bases. Zone consultants gave inservice assistance on an individual basis. CECs met several times during the school year to receive information on timely administrative problems.

The major goals of the staff development component were that:

- by February 1971 all classroom teachers and aides will have achieved a score of 90% or better on locally devised, separate rating lists of approximately 20 prescriptive-teaching elements as rated by self and CEC;
- all counselors will demonstrate their improved skills in identifying pupils' strengths and weaknesses in learning as determined by no difference among pupils, teachers, and counselor on separate instruments; and
- by May 1971 all compensatory education coordinators will have achieved a score of 90% or higher on improved skills in the administration of the local ESEA Title I project, as rated by self and staff on a locally devised scale of approximately 20 essential qualities of successful project administration.

At year-end staff members were asked to rate staff development and to make comments (Form 101G). Prescriptive teaching was rated pre and post in February and May (Form 101F). Counselors, teachers, and pupils rated counseling pre and post (Forms 103 B and C). CECs were rated on administrative skills pre and post in November and May (Form 101E).

The SAC Program Evaluation (Form 101G) listed 15 items under staff development; these were rated on a 1-5, strongly agree-strongly disagree scale. The highest ratings (3.6) were given to staff development by the auxiliary services, classified staff, and aides (Table 85); the lowest ratings were assigned by the central office (2.4) and the CECs (2.8). The median score of 3.3 was neutral.

Certain ideas were expressed frequently in the comments on the SAC Program Evaluation. They have been summarized as follows:

Little or no inservice was received on prescriptive teaching.

Responsibility for inservice generally rested with the central office staff; in reading and mathematics, the prime responsibility was placed on the reading and mathematics coordinators within the school.

Excellent inservice training would aid in retaining qualified SAC teachers.

That their individual school had adequate to good inservice, was expressed by a few.

Education Aides III expressed a desire for more inservice, as did the reading and mathematics coordinators and the SAC teachers.

Typical comments from the evaluation form in regard to prescriptive teaching workshops were:

I know of none.

Have been very few.

None has been scheduled.

For evaluation purposes, zone consultants were asked in January about prescriptive teaching inservice. One wrote: "There have been no prescriptive teaching workshops this school year. Nor are there any plans for such at this time." Another suggested replacing the item (Form 101F), "I attend prescriptive teaching workshops weekly" with "I meet with other department members to assist each other." Regarding the inservice items, another consultant wrote, "Somewhat irrelevant. There has been no money for Title One prescriptive workshops."

The results from the pre-post evaluation of the effects of inservice on prescriptive teaching (Form 101F) showed gains were so small as not to be statistically significant (Table 80).

Although overall mean gains on Form 101F were positive, the scores achieved pre and post were 78% to 80% (teachers' self ratings), 80% to 86% (CEC's ratings of teachers), 78% to 82% (aides' self ratings), and 76% to 82% (CEC's ratings of aides). The very small movement from pre to post indicated that little change occurred. The objective of attaining a score of 90% or better was not achieved.

The Counseling Profile, a locally devised rating scale, was used pre and post to demonstrate improved skills in counselors' identification of pupil strengths and weaknesses in learning. Counselors indicated on this rating scale (Table 70) that the pre-post differences they saw in pupils were statistically significant in all 23 instances. This perfect statistical occurrence was confirmed by pupils on only two of the 23 items. Arithmetic teachers agreed with the counselor in four instances, and teachers agreed in 10. The arithmetic teacher agreed with neither the pupil nor the reading teacher, while the reading teacher agreed with the pupil in only two instances.

In light of these findings, it was concluded that the objective for counselor inservice was only minimally attained: 9% with pupils, 17% with arithmetic teachers, and 65% with reading teachers. In fact, the counselor, and to a certain extent the reading teacher, recorded many significant statistical changes that the pupil did not realize or reflect in his self-ratings.

Compensatory education coordinators were rated pre and post on their administrative skills (Form 101E). Seven categories of staff from principal to clerk independently completed the rating scales (Table 81). Based on all items, the greatest positive difference between pre and post ratings for an individual CEC was .6 on a 1-5 scale while the greatest regression was -1.7 (Table 82). The average of the pre means was 4.0 (80%) while the post mean average was 3.9 (78%), a regression of .1 (2%). The objective which called for a score of 90% or more was not achieved.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: With few exceptions, school workshops for reading and mathematics were not held on a regular basis. Zone consultants reported that they conducted no inservice workshops and that they did not have any money with which to conduct them. As a compromise, they met informally with individuals or small groups.

No workshops were held for intergroup relations.

Counselors met periodically throughout the school year.

As the staff development component is mandated, it is recommended that ESEA project managers give area coordinators, SAC principals, and CECs appropriate directives and support for fulfilling the federal requirements that all personnel must participate in inservice, and that staff development must be planned as a series of ongoing activities, not as a one-time event.

Plans for the year's inservice for each category of staff should be submitted at the beginning of the school year by those responsible for conducting the training. Monthly notices of inservice meetings should be submitted one month prior to the workshop dates. The above plans and reports should be sent to the central, area, and evaluation offices.

Inservice should be planned for specific groups; content of training should be clearly defined to include the specific topics mandated by the federal guidelines.

Table 52 — Analysis of Covariance, All Junior High Pupils—CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	89.9	3209	20.4 (4.9)[a]	23.4 (5.4)[a]	23.4
Comparison	88.7	419	20.2 (4.9)	22.7 (5.4)	22.9
				F(1,3624) =	4.92*
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	89.8	3174	21.6 (4.4)	25.7 (5.0)	25.7
Comparison	88.9	419	21.7 (4.4)	24.5 (4.9)	24.4
				F(1,3589) =	17.9**
Total Reading					
ESEA	89.9	3102	42.1 (4.7)	49.3 (5.3)	49.3
Comparison	89.0	401	42.2 (4.7)	47.6 (5.2)	47.5
				F(1,3499) =	16.05**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	90.0	3129	13.9 (4.8)	16.4 (5.2)	16.3
Comparison	88.6	413	13.3 (4.6)	15.4 (5.1)	15.8
				F(1,3538) =	5.29*
Language Expression					
ESEA	90.0	3110	16.2 (4.1)	18.2 (4.8)	18.2
Comparison	88.9	404	16.2 (4.1)	17.7 (4.8)	17.7
				F(1,3510) =	6.35*
Language Spelling					
ESEA	89.9	3067	17.5 (5.0)	19.3 (5.2)	19.4
Comparison	88.9	407	17.8 (5.0)	19.4 (5.2)	19.2
				F(1,3470) =	0.64
Total Language					
ESEA	90.0	2972	47.8 (4.8)	54.2 (5.3)	54.2
Comparison	89.2	384	47.9 (4.8)	53.2 (5.2)	53.2
				F(1,3352) =	5.28*
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	89.7	3193	33.8 (5.3)	37.8 (5.9)	37.7
Comparison	88.4	407	32.5 (5.2)	34.6 (5.4)	35.4
				F(1,3596) =	63.49**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	89.8	3153	17.3 (4.9)	19.8 (5.6)	19.8
Comparison	88.4	412	16.6 (4.9)	18.6 (5.4)	19.1
				F(1,3561) =	11.17**
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	89.8	3131	9.5 (5.0)	11.4 (5.3)	11.4
Comparison	88.8	385	9.5 (5.0)	11.0 (5.3)	11.0
				F(1,3512) =	4.17*
Total Arithmetic					
ESEA	89.8	3043	61.0 (5.1)	69.2 (5.7)	69.2
Comparison	88.9	371	60.0 (5.0)	65.5 (5.5)	66.3
				F(1,3410) =	34.07**

Note.—Table 52 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 2. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 53 — Analysis of Covariance, All Senior High Pupils—CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	85.0	338	15.8 (5.5)[a]	19.4 (6.4)[a]	19.5
Comparison	87.8	34	17.5 (6.1)	20.6 (6.8)	19.1
				F(1,368) =	0.14
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	84.7	331	18.7 (4.5)	21.5 (5.2)	21.6
Comparison	87.5	31	21.1 (4.9)	23.8 (5.6)	22.1
				F(1,358) =	0.24
Total Reading					
ESEA	84.8	322	34.5 (5.1)	40.8 (5.8)	41.1
Comparison	87.5	31	38.4 (5.4)	44.0 (6.2)	41.0
				F(1,349) =	0.03
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	84.8	342	11.8 (5.3)	14.0 (6.0)	14.0
Comparison	87.9	34	12.5 (5.6)	15.4 (6.4)	14.8
				F(1,372) =	1.04
Language Expression					
ESEA	84.6	345	12.4 (4.0)	14.0 (5.0)	14.1
Comparison	87.4	35	13.9 (5.0)	14.6 (5.5)	13.7
				F(1,376) =	0.40
Language Spelling					
ESEA	84.9	338	13.1 (5.2)	14.5 (5.8)	14.6
Comparison	87.9	33	14.6 (5.8)	15.4 (5.8)	14.4
				F(1,367) =	0.05
Total Language					
ESEA	84.8	328	37.7 (5.0)	43.0 (5.6)	43.3
Comparison	88.3	30	42.3 (5.5)	47.1 (6.3)	43.6
				F(1,354) =	0.04
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	84.9	333	21.7 (5.6)	24.9 (6.1)	25.1
Comparison	87.0	41	23.4 (5.8)	26.2 (6.3)	24.8
				F(1,370) =	0.08
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	84.9	332	13.2 (5.1)	15.1 (5.8)	15.3
Comparison	87.3	40	15.6 (6.2)	16.8 (6.6)	15.2
				F(1,368) =	0.01
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	85.0	326	8.1 (5.2)	8.9 (5.7)	9.0
Comparison	87.6	38	9.5 (6.1)	9.8 (6.1)	9.0
				F(1,360) =	0.02
Total Arithmetic					
ESEA	85.0	313	43.2 (5.3)	49.3 (5.9)	49.9
Comparison	87.6	38	49.8 (6.0)	54.3 (6.5)	49.2
				F(1,347) =	0.18

Note.—Table 53 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post.
[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

Table 54 — Analysis of Covariance, Junior High Black—CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	90.6	1977	20.9 (5.0)[a]	23.8 (5.6)[a]	23.8
Comparison	88.8	235	20.0 (4.9)	22.3 (5.2)	23.0
				F(1,2208) =	4.43*
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	90.6	1955	22.0 (4.4)	25.8 (5.0)	25.8
Comparison	89.0	232	21.6 (4.4)	24.2 (4.7)	24.6
				F(1,2183) =	9.32**
Total Reading					
ESEA	90.7	1905	43.0 (4.7)	49.9 (5.4)	49.8
Comparison	89.0	226	41.9 (4.7)	46.9 (5.1)	47.9
				F(1,2127) =	9.71**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	90.8	1910	14.2 (4.8)	16.3 (5.2)	16.2
Comparison	88.6	235	13.1 (4.6)	15.2 (5.1)	15.9
				F(1,2141) =	1.43
Language Expression					
ESEA	90.7	1900	16.5 (4.4)	18.2 (4.8)	18.2
Comparison	88.8	232	16.0 (4.1)	17.2 (4.4)	17.6
				F(1,2128) =	4.35*
Language Spelling					
ESEA	90.7	1874	18.0 (5.0)	19.7 (5.4)	19.7
Comparison	89.3	224	18.0 (5.0)	19.6 (5.4)	19.5
				F(1,2094) =	0.35
Total Language					
ESEA	90.9	1810	48.9 (4.8)	54.5 (5.3)	54.4
Comparison	89.3	219	47.6 (4.8)	52.6 (5.2)	53.6
				F(1,2025) =	1.82
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	90.4	1962	33.8 (5.3)	37.6 (5.9)	37.4
Comparison	88.7	229	31.6 (5.0)	33.0 (5.2)	34.3
				F(1,2187) =	69.95**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	90.4	1931	17.1 (4.9)	19.5 (5.6)	19.5
Comparison	88.9	232	16.2 (4.7)	17.8 (5.1)	18.4
				F(1,2159) =	19.26**
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	90.4	1916	9.3 (4.7)	11.1 (5.3)	11.1
Comparison	89.8	208	9.3 (4.7)	10.3 (5.0)	10.3
				F(1,2120) =	12.26**
Total Arithmetic					
ESEA	90.5	1863	60.6 (5.1)	68.6 (5.7)	68.5
Comparison	89.8	200	59.0 (5.0)	62.7 (5.2)	63.8
				F(1,2059) =	51.65**

Note.—Table 54 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 2. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 55 — Analysis of Covariance, Senior High Black—CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	84.8	177	17.0 (5.8)[a]	19.4 (5.4)[a]	19.4
Comparison	87.0	20	15.8 (5.5)	17.8 (6.1)	18.4
				F(1,193) =	0.66
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	84.7	175	20.0 (4.7)	21.4 (4.9)	21.3
Comparison	86.4	18	19.5 (4.7)	20.8 (4.9)	21.0
				F(1,189) =	0.10
Total Reading					
ESEA	84.7	175	37.1 (5.3)	40.8 (5.8)	40.7
Comparison	86.4	18	35.0 (5.1)	38.2 (5.4)	39.5
				F(1,189) =	0.49
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	84.8	179	12.7 (5.6)	13.9 (6.0)	13.9
Comparison	87.3	22	11.4 (4.9)	14.6 (6.4)	15.0
				F(1,197) =	1.65
Language Expression					
ESEA	84.7	180	13.1 (4.5)	14.1 (5.0)	14.1
Comparison	86.7	23	12.8 (4.5)	13.3 (4.5)	13.3
				F(1,199) =	1.16
Language Spelling					
ESEA	84.7	178	14.5 (5.8)	14.4 (5.5)	14.3
Comparison	87.1	19	13.3 (5.2)	13.5 (5.5)	14.2
				F(1,193) =	0.01
Total Language					
ESEA	84.9	176	40.6 (5.4)	42.8 (5.6)	42.7
Comparison	87.9	18	38.9 (5.1)	43.7 (5.8)	44.5
				F(1,190) =	1.37
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	84.6	173	22.3 (5.6)	23.4 (5.8)	23.3
Comparison	86.3	26	21.0 (5.5)	22.2 (5.6)	22.9
				F(1,195) =	0.12
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	84.7	177	13.5 (5.4)	15.3 (5.8)	15.4
Comparison	86.3	26	14.7 (5.8)	15.4 (5.8)	14.6
				F(1,199) =	1.00
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	84.7	176	8.3 (5.2)	9.2 (5.7)	9.2
Comparison	86.7	24	9.0 (5.7)	9.6 (6.1)	9.0
				F(1,196) =	0.10
Total Arithmetic					
ESEA	84.7	171	44.3 (5.4)	48.0 (5.8)	48.3
Comparison	86.7	24	46.3 (5.6)	48.8 (5.9)	46.9
				F(1,191) =	0.48

Note.—Table 55 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

Table 56 — Analysis of Covariance, Junior High Brown—CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	88.5	1150	19.6 (4.9)[a]	22.7 (5.4)[a]	22.8
Comparison	88.3	163	20.4 (4.9)	23.0 (5.4)	22.5
				F(1,1309) =	0.77
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	88.4	1134	20.9 (4.3)	25.5 (5.0)	25.6
Comparison	88.5	164	21.7 (4.4)	24.6 (4.9)	24.2
				F(1,1294) =	9.29**
Total Reading					
ESEA	88.4	1115	40.6 (4.6)	48.4 (5.2)	48.6
Comparison	88.7	154	42.4 (4.7)	48.0 (5.2)	46.8
				F(1,1265) =	6.43*
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	88.5	1138	13.5 (4.8)	16.5 (5.5)	16.4
Comparison	88.2	158	13.2 (4.6)	15.5 (5.1)	15.7
				F(1,1292) =	4.57*
Language Expression					
ESEA	88.6	1129	15.6 (4.1)	18.3 (4.8)	18.3
Comparison	88.7	151	16.3 (4.1)	18.2 (4.8)	17.9
				F(1,1276) =	1.71
Language Spelling					
ESEA	88.4	1113	16.6 (4.9)	18.7 (5.2)	18.7
Comparison	88.2	162	17.0 (4.9)	18.9 (5.2)	18.6
				F(1,1271) =	0.12
Total Language					
ESEA	88.4	1083	45.8 (4.6)	53.5 (5.3)	53.6
Comparison	89.0	145	47.2 (4.7)	53.3 (5.2)	52.3
				F(1,1224) =	3.02
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	88.5	1142	33.6 (5.3)	38.0 (5.9)	38.0
Comparison	87.7	159	33.4 (5.2)	36.4 (5.6)	36.5
				F(1,1297) =	10.28**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	88.6	1133	17.6 (5.1)	20.1 (5.6)	20.1
Comparison	87.4	161	16.9 (4.9)	19.7 (5.6)	20.1
				F(1,1290) =	0.01
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	88.6	1127	9.8 (5.0)	11.6 (5.6)	11.6
Comparison	87.4	159	9.6 (5.0)	11.6 (5.6)	11.7
				F(1,1282) =	0.23
Total Arithmetic					
ESEA	88.5	1094	61.2 (5.1)	70.0 (5.8)	70.0
Comparison	87.7	153	60.2 (5.0)	68.1 (5.6)	68.8
				F(1,1243) =	1.95

Note.—Table 56 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 2. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 57 — Analysis of Covariance, Senior High Brown—CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	85.2	155	14.4 (4.9)[a]	19.6 (6.6)[a]	20.0
Comparison	89.1	14	20.0 (6.6)	24.7 (7.6)	20.3
				F(1,165) =	0.03
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	84.8	150	17.3 (4.1)	21.8 (5.2)	22.0
Comparison	89.0	13	23.4 (5.4)	27.8 (6.9)	24.6
				F(1,159) =	2.24
Total Reading					
ESEA	85.0	141	31.7 (4.6)	41.2 (5.8)	42.0
Comparison	89.0	13	43.0 (6.1)	52.0 (7.2)	43.5
				F(1,150) =	0.201
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	84.9	157	10.8 (4.9)	14.1 (6.0)	14.3
Comparison	88.9	12	14.6 (6.4)	16.9 (7.4)	15.0
				F(1,165) =	0.25
Language Expression					
ESEA	84.6	159	11.8 (4.0)	14.0 (5.0)	14.2
Comparison	88.9	12	16.0 (6.2)	17.3 (6.8)	15.1
				F(1,167) =	0.44
Language Spelling					
ESEA	85.1	154	11.6 (4.9)	14.8 (5.8)	15.0
Comparison	89.1	14	16.4 (6.3)	18.0 (7.2)	15.5
				F(1,164) =	0.14
Total Language					
ESEA	84.8	146	34.7 (4.6)	43.6 (5.8)	44.3
Comparison	88.9	12	47.4 (6.3)	52.2 (7.2)	43.9
				F(1,154) =	0.02
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	85.2	154	21.0 (5.5)	26.6 (6.5)	27.1
Comparison	88.1	15	27.5 (6.7)	33.1 (7.8)	28.2
				F(1,165) =	0.40
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	85.3	149	12.8 (5.1)	14.9 (5.8)	15.1
Comparison	89.1	14	17.2 (7.0)	19.3 (7.3)	16.8
				F(1,159) =	2.14
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	85.4	145	7.9 (5.2)	8.6 (5.7)	8.8
Comparison	89.1	14	10.3 (6.1)	10.6 (6.5)	9.0
				F(1,155) =	0.06
Total Arithmetic					
ESEA	85.5	137	42.1 (5.2)	50.7 (6.1)	51.8
Comparison	89.1	14	55.9 (6.7)	63.9 (7.4)	53.5
				F(1,147) =	0.37

Note.—Table 57 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

Table 58 — Analysis of Covariance, All Junior High, Above Chance CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	90.7	2744	22.4 (5.2)[a]	25.3 (5.8)[a]	25.3
Comparison	89.9	356	22.4 (5.2)	24.7 (5.8)	24.7
				F(1,3096) =	5.97*
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	90.7	2776	23.2 (4.5)	27.2 (5.3)	27.2
Comparison	89.9	357	23.4 (4.5)	26.5 (5.3)	26.4
				F(1,3129) =	6.89**
Reading Total					
ESEA	90.5	2824	44.4 (4.8)	51.5 (5.6)	51.5
Comparison	89.5	368	44.4 (4.8)	49.8 (5.4)	49.8
				F(1,3188) =	14.16**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	90.5	2782	15.0 (5.1)	17.3 (5.5)	17.3
Comparison	89.4	343	14.9 (5.1)	17.2 (5.5)	17.3
				F(1,3121) =	0.01
Language Expression					
ESEA	90.5	2711	17.4 (4.4)	19.3 (5.2)	19.3
Comparison	89.5	349	17.5 (4.9)	19.1 (5.2)	19.1
				F(1,3056) =	1.71
Language Spelling					
ESEA	90.4	2793	18.6 (5.2)	20.3 (5.4)	20.4
Comparison	89.7	359	19.4 (5.2)	20.8 (5.6)	20.4
				F(1,3148) =	0.02
Language Total					
ESEA	90.3	2846	49.0 (4.8)	55.4 (5.3)	55.5
Comparison	89.5	355	50.2 (4.9)	55.7 (5.4)	55.0
				F(1,3197) =	1.47
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	89.9	3125	34.3 (5.3)	38.1 (5.9)	38.0
Comparison	88.5	390	33.4 (5.2)	35.4 (5.4)	35.9
				F(1,3511) =	63.36**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	89.9	3031	17.8 (5.1)	20.2 (5.6)	20.1
Comparison	88.8	381	17.4 (4.9)	19.4 (5.4)	19.6
				F(1,3408) =	6.67**
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	90.8	2344	11.2 (5.3)	12.7 (6.0)	12.7
Comparison	90.2	286	11.2 (5.3)	12.5 (6.0)	12.5
				F(1,2626) =	1.77
Arithmetic Total					
ESEA	89.9	3011	61.4 (5.1)	69.6 (5.8)	69.5
Comparison	89.2	362	60.9 (5.1)	66.4 (5.5)	66.8
				F(1,3369) =	31.25**

Note.—Table 58 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 2. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post.
[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 59 — Analysis of Covariance, All Senior High, Above Chance CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	87.0	238	18.6 (6.4)[a]	22.5 (7.1)[a]	22.7
Comparison	91.0	23	21.7 (7.0)	24.8 (7.6)	22.4
				F(1,257) =	0.09
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	86.0	260	21.0 (4.9)	23.6 (5.6)	23.8
Comparison	88.7	25	24.0 (5.6)	26.6 (6.6)	24.8
				F(1,281) =	1.01
Reading Total					
ESEA	86.1	260	38.1 (5.4)	44.6 (6.4)	45.0
Comparison	88.7	25	43.4 (6.1)	49.1 (6.9)	45.0
				F(1,281) =	0.00
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	85.8	277	13.4 (5.6)	15.3 (6.4)	15.3
Comparison	88.6	30	13.8 (6.0)	16.3 (6.9)	15.9
				F(1,303) =	0.59
Language Expression					
ESEA	86.1	267	14.0 (5.0)	15.4 (5.5)	15.5
Comparison	89.7	27	15.6 (6.2)	16.4 (6.2)	15.5
				F(1,290) =	0.01
Language Spelling					
ESEA	85.9	284	14.5 (5.8)	15.8 (6.3)	15.8
Comparison	89.7	28	16.2 (6.3)	16.8 (6.8)	15.9
				F(1,308) =	0.00
Language Total					
ESEA	85.5	296	39.9 (5.2)	44.9 (6.0)	45.2
Comparison	88.8	28	44.1 (5.8)	48.6 (6.7)	45.6
				F(1,320) =	0.06
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	85.9	284	23.6 (6.0)	26.9 (6.5)	27.1
Comparison	87.9	35	25.7 (6.3)	28.7 (6.9)	27.2
				F(1,315) =	0.01
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	86.0	290	14.2 (5.4)	16.2 (6.2)	16.4
Comparison	87.8	37	16.3 (6.2)	17.7 (7.0)	16.5
				F(1,323) =	0.04
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	87.1	213	9.6 (6.1)	10.6 (6.5)	10.7
Comparison	88.7	30	10.6 (6.5)	11.3 (6.5)	10.7
				F(1,239) =	0.01
Arithmetic Total					
ESEA	85.9	282	45.8 (5.6)	51.7 (6.2)	52.3
Comparison	88.3	35	51.9 (6.2)	57.1 (6.8)	52.4
				F(1,313) =	0.01

Note.—Table 59 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post.
[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

Table 60 — Analysis of Covariance, Junior High Black, Above Chance CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	91.4	1703	22.8 (5.4)[a]	25.7 (6.0)[a]	25.7
Comparison	89.9	195	22.5 (5.4)	24.6 (5.8)	24.9
				F(1,1894) =	5.91*
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	91.3	1721	23.6 (4.7)	27.3 (5.3)	27.3
Comparison	89.9	195	23.5 (4.7)	26.6 (5.3)	26.7
				F(1,1912) =	2.17
Reading Total					
ESEA	91.2	1736	45.3 (4.9)	52.2 (5.6)	52.1
Comparison	89.5	203	44.7 (4.9)	49.8 (5.4)	50.3
				F(1,1935) =	8.50**
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	91.4	1697	15.3 (5.1)	17.4 (5.5)	17.3
Comparison	89.8	192	14.8 (5.1)	17.0 (5.5)	17.4
				F(1,1885) =	0.01
Language Expression					
ESEA	91.4	1659	17.7 (4.8)	19.4 (5.2)	19.3
Comparison	89.6	195	17.3 (4.4)	19.0 (5.2)	19.3
				F(1,1850) =	0.03
Language Spelling					
ESEA	91.1	1717	19.1 (5.2)	20.7 (5.6)	20.7
Comparison	90.1	196	19.7 (5.4)	21.2 (5.6)	20.8
				F(1,1909) =	0.01
Language Total					
ESEA	91.2	1739	50.1 (4.9)	55.8 (5.4)	55.8
Comparison	89.8	200	50.2 (4.9)	55.7 (5.4)	55.7
				F(1,1935) =	0.01
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	90.5	1920	34.3 (5.3)	37.9 (5.9)	37.8
Comparison	89.1	217	32.7 (5.2)	33.8 (5.3)	34.8
				F(1,2133) =	66.70**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	90.6	1846	17.6 (5.1)	19.9 (5.6)	19.9
Comparison	89.7	210	17.2 (4.9)	18.7 (5.4)	19.0
				F(1,2052) =	12.20**
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	91.6	1405	11.1 (5.3)	12.6 (6.0)	12.6
Comparison	91.6	149	11.0 (5.3)	12.0 (5.6)	12.0
				F(1,1550) =	5.23*
Arithmetic Total					
ESEA	90.6	1841	61.1 (5.1)	69.0 (5.7)	68.9
Comparison	90.2	193	60.4 (5.0)	63.9 (5.3)	64.5
				F(1,2030) =	46.06**

Note.—Table 60 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 2. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 61 — Analysis of Covariance, Senior High Black, Above Chance CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	86.9	131	19.5 (6.6)[a]	22.6 (7.2)[a]	22.8
Comparison	93.0	10	22.6 (7.2)	23.4 (7.2)	20.8
				F(1,137) =	2.23
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	86.0	142	22.3 (5.2)	23.5 (5.6)	23.6
Comparison	88.0	13	23.7 (5.6)	24.5 (6.0)	23.4
				F(1,151) =	0.02
Reading Total					
ESEA	86.3	146	40.4 (5.7)	44.5 (6.4)	44.6
Comparison	88.0	13	41.9 (6.0)	44.3 (6.2)	42.8
				F(1,155) =	0.86
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	86.3	147	14.3 (6.0)	15.5 (6.9)	15.5
Comparison	88.4	18	13.2 (5.6)	15.8 (6.9)	16.1
				F(1,161) =	0.55
Language Expression					
ESEA	86.2	148	14.4 (5.0)	15.4 (5.5)	15.4
Comparison	89.9	16	14.6 (5.5)	15.5 (6.2)	15.2
				F(1,160) =	0.14
Language Spelling					
ESEA	85.9	152	15.9 (6.3)	15.8 (6.3)	15.8
Comparison	89.9	15	15.3 (5.8)	15.3 (5.8)	15.5
				F(1,163) =	0.09
Language Total					
ESEA	85.6	161	42.8 (5.6)	45.0 (6.0)	44.9
Comparison	88.4	17	40.2 (5.2)	45.1 (6.0)	46.5
				F(1,174) =	0.99
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	86.2	143	24.9 (6.1)	25.8 (6.3)	25.8
Comparison	87.7	20	24.3 (6.0)	25.4 (6.1)	25.6
				F(1,159) =	0.03
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	85.9	153	14.8 (5.8)	16.6 (6.6)	16.7
Comparison	87.0	23	15.7 (6.2)	16.7 (6.6)	16.1
				F(1,172) =	0.67
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	87.0	118	9.8 (6.1)	10.9 (6.5)	11.0
Comparison	88.9	18	10.2 (6.1)	11.0 (6.5)	10.6
				F(1,132) =	0.32
Arithmetic Total					
ESEA	85.5	150	47.6 (5.8)	51.4 (6.1)	51.7
Comparison	87.8	21	49.3 (5.9)	52.5 (6.4)	51.0
				F(1,167) =	0.11

Note.—Table 61 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

Table 62 — Analysis of Covariance, Junior High Brown, Above Chance CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	89.4	972	21.6 (5.2)[a]	24.6 (5.8)[a]	24.7
Comparison	89.4	142	22.0 (5.2)	24.6 (5.8)	24.3
				F(1,1110) =	0.98
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	89.5	983	22.7 (4.5)	27.0 (5.3)	27.1
Comparison	89.5	140	23.3 (4.5)	26.4 (5.0)	26.0
				F(1,1119) =	5.06*
Reading Total					
ESEA	89.2	1015	42.9 (4.7)	50.5 (5.5)	50.6
Comparison	89.3	144	44.0 (4.8)	49.7 (5.4)	48.9
				F(1,1155) =	5.64*
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	89.0	1016	14.5 (5.1)	17.2 (5.5)	17.2
Comparison	88.7	132	14.7 (5.1)	17.3 (5.5)	17.2
				F(1,1144) =	-0.01
Language Expression					
ESEA	89.0	984	16.9 (4.4)	19.3 (5.2)	19.3
Comparison	89.3	133	17.6 (4.8)	19.2 (5.2)	18.8
				F(1,1113) =	2.67
Language Spelling					
ESEA	89.0	1004	17.8 (5.0)	19.7 (5.4)	19.8
Comparison	89.0	143	18.6 (5.2)	20.2 (5.4)	19.7
				F(1,1143) =	0.07
Language Total					
ESEA	88.8	1034	47.1 (4.7)	54.7 (5.3)	54.9
Comparison	89.0	135	49.2 (4.8)	55.2 (5.3)	53.8
				F(1,1165) =	2.21
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	88.7	1116	34.0 (5.3)	38.4 (5.9)	38.4
Comparison	87.5	154	34.1 (5.3)	36.9 (5.7)	36.9
				F(1,1266) =	12.02**
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	88.8	1100	17.9 (5.1)	20.4 (5.6)	20.4
Comparison	87.5	153	17.4 (4.9)	20.1 (5.6)	20.3
				F(1,1249) =	0.05
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	89.3	869	11.3 (5.3)	12.9 (6.0)	12.9
Comparison	88.4	120	11.2 (5.3)	12.9 (6.0)	12.9
				F(1,985) =	0.03
Arithmetic Total					
ESEA	88.6	1084	61.5 (5.2)	70.3 (5.8)	70.2
Comparison	87.7	151	60.8 (5.1)	68.5 (5.7)	69.0
				F(1,1231) =	2.42

Note.—Table 62 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 2. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 63 — Analysis of Covariance, Senior High, Brown Above Chance CTBS Results

SUBTEST AND GROUP	MEAN IQ, COVARIATE	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED POST MEAN
Reading Vocabulary					
ESEA	87.4	104	17.5 (6.1)[a]	22.5 (7.2)[a]	22.9
Comparison	89.5	13	21.0 (6.8)	25.9 (7.8)	23.2
				F(1,113) =	0.03
Reading Comprehension					
ESEA	86.0	115	19.7 (4.7)	23.9 (5.6)	24.1
Comparison	89.4	12	24.4 (5.6)	28.8 (7.2)	26.8
				F(1,123) =	2.81
Reading Total					
ESEA	86.1	110	35.5 (5.2)	45.3 (6.4)	46.0
Comparison	89.4	12	45.1 (6.4)	54.3 (7.4)	48.0
				F(1,118) =	0.34
Language Mechanics					
ESEA	85.5	126	12.3 (5.3)	15.2 (6.4)	15.3
Comparison	88.9	12	14.6 (6.4)	16.9 (7.4)	15.8
				F(1,134) =	0.12
Language Expression					
ESEA	86.0	115	13.7 (5.0)	15.4 (5.5)	15.6
Comparison	89.4	11	17.0 (6.8)	17.7 (7.4)	16.2
				F(1,122) =	0.25
Language Spelling					
ESEA	85.9	128	12.9 (5.2)	15.7 (6.3)	15.9
Comparison	89.5	13	17.3 (6.8)	18.5 (7.7)	16.4
				F(1,137) =	0.09
Language Total					
ESEA	85.6	130	36.9 (4.9)	45.1 (6.0)	45.9
Comparison	89.4	11	50.2 (6.9)	54.0 (7.6)	45.1
				F(1,137) =	0.04
Arithmetic Computation					
ESEA	85.7	135	22.4 (5.6)	28.0 (6.7)	28.4
Comparison	88.1	15	27.5 (6.7)	33.1 (7.8)	29.5
				F(1,146) =	0.37
Arithmetic Concepts					
ESEA	86.2	132	13.8 (5.4)	15.8 (6.2)	16.0
Comparison	89.1	14	17.2 (6.6)	19.3 (7.3)	17.7
				F(1,142) =	2.30
Arithmetic Applications					
ESEA	87.5	93	9.5 (6.1)	10.2 (6.1)	10.4
Comparison	88.4	12	11.1 (6.5)	11.8 (6.8)	11.8
				F(1,101) =	0.39
Arithmetic Total					
ESEA	86.1	128	43.8 (5.4)	52.2 (6.2)	53.2
Comparison	89.1	14	55.9 (6.7)	63.9 (7.4)	54.9
				F(1,138) =	0.36

Note.—Table 63 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form R, Level 3. Statistical analysis was performed by BMD04V computer program (modified) on an IBM System/360. N column includes only pupils with complete scores: IQ, pre, and post. Pupils identified and grouped by ethnicity, not by school.

[a]Approximate grade equivalent based on rounded raw score, not interpolated.

Table 64 — Two-Year Achievement Gains

TEST	Grade-Norm Months for Matched Cases					
	7th Grade		8th Grade		9th Grade	
	1969-70	1970-71	1969-70	1970-71	1969-70	1970-71
Reading						
Vocabulary	0	6	2	10	3	6
Comprehension	2	7	4	10	5	12
Language						
Mechanics	6	6	10	9	6	6
Expression	-1	7	5	13	5	5
Spelling	5	3	3	4	3	9
Arithmetic						
Computation	6	8	3	9	9	10
Concepts	2	7	5	9	10	10
Application	2	9	2	6	7	10
Mean Medians	3	7	4	9	6	9

Note.—Table 64 is based on Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Statistical analysis was performed by the YMEDLEV Quick Median computer program on an IBM System/360. The 1970-71 tenth-graders are not represented in this table since they lack baseline data from 1969-70 when only grades 7-9 were in SAC.

Table 65 — Pupils Meeting or Exceeding Performance Objective

TEST	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9			Grade 10		
	Matched N	N Gaining 10 mo. or More	Percentage	Matched N	N Gaining 10 mo. or More	Percentage	Matched N	N Gaining 10 mo. or More	Percentage	Matched N	N Gaining 10 mo. or More	Percentage
Reading												
Vocabulary	1867	537	29	841	290	34	570	200	35	338	150	44
Comprehension	1821	722	40	841	373	44	564	264	47	332	118	36
Total Test	1776	600	34	828	340	41	558	231	41	323	134	41
Language												
Mechanics	1806	785	43	829	412	50	555	252	45	342	164	48
Expression	1788	696	39	827	377	46	552	256	46	343	146	43
Spelling	1742	529	30	817	264	32	565	162	29	337	116	34
Total Test	1672	525	31	810	298	37	544	201	37	326	129	40
Arithmetic												
Computation	1789	833	47	826	398	48	519	240	46	333	111	33
Concepts	1760	696	40	825	355	43	513	254	50	332	136	41
Applications	1744	725	42	819	343	42	512	243	47	326	111	34
Total Test	1680	595	35	806	293	36	501	188	36	312	110	35

Note.—Table 65 is based on statistical analysis of pre-post (matched pair) CTBS results, performed by the YMEDLEV Quick Median computer program on an IBM System/360.

Table 66 — Pupils Achieving at or Above Grade Equivalent (GE) on the CTBS

TEST	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9			Grade 10		
	Total Pupils Posttested[a]	Total GE 8.0 6/71	Percentage	Total Pupils Posttested[a]	Total GE 9.0 6/71	Percentage	Total Pupils Posttested[a]	Total GE 10.0 6/71	Percentage	Total Pupils Posttested[a]	Total GE 11.0 6/71	Percentage
Reading												
Vocabulary	2243	263	12	932	128	14	624	87	14	338	39	12
Comprehension	2204	371	17	935	186	20	625	132	21	332	15	5
Total	2165	251	12	925	135	15	615	81	13	323	19	6
Language												
Mechanics	2222	565	25	921	302	33	613	234	38	406	88	22
Expression	2201	463	21	916	229	25	607	142	23	405	37	9
Spelling	2159	468	22	913	260	28	624	164	26	401	40	10
Total	2089	329	16	903	187	21	598	133	22	399	26	7
Arithmetic												
Computation	2277	651	29	926	247	27	599	125	21	416	15	4
Concepts	2244	480	21	925	172	19	595	74	12	417	9	2
Applications	2230	406	18	925	182	20	595	120	20	416	23	6
Total	2173	378	17	913	140	15	586	61	10	412	8	2

Note.—Table 66 is based on statistical analysis of post Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills scores, performed by the YMEDLEV Quick Median computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Cases were included for the given grade level if individual raw scores fell within one standard error of measure of the required true score, according to the publisher's technical report and table of norms for determining grade equivalents.

Table 67 — Tally Record of Counseling Activities

ITEM	SAC Counselors N=21	Consulting Counselors N=4
SERVICES TO PUPILS		
1. Individual counseling	8375	1707
2. Group counseling	779	403
3. Guidance activities	765	48
4. Guidance conferences	3423	250
5. Intake process (screening, selection, placement, programming)	2691	41
6. Pupil appraisal	1579	329
7. Recording on cums, interview notes, etc.	5491	740
CONSULTATION WITH:		
8. Consulting Counselors	1321	287
9. SAC Teachers	4560	562
10. Non-SAC Teachers	2616	136
11. SAC Counselors	1512	641
12. Non-SAC Counselors	2412	83
13. Head Counselors	1452	104
14. Administrators	1756	172
15. Compensatory Education Coordinator	3879	493
16. SAC Nurse	1361	329
17. Doctor	60	9
18. School Nurse	1044	60
19. Aides	3084	211
20. Community agency	351	67
Parents:		
21. at school	1419	108
22. at home	353	33
23. by phone	2872	169
24. in groups	246	60
STAFF DEVELOPMENT		
25. Inservice, local school	174	50
26. Inservice, central office	166	149

Continued

Table 67 — Continued

ITEM	SAC Counselors N=21	Consulting Counselors N=4
27. SAC staff meeting, local school	473	237
28. Student intergroup meetings	57	6
OTHER ACTIVITIES		
29. Field trips, parent advisory, visiting elementary schools, etc.	552	102
30. Class observation and supervision, etc.	249	45

Note.—Table 67 is based on Form 103A. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

Table 68 — Mean Scores for Counseling Profile - Brown Pupils

ITEM	Max. N	PUPIL Pre	PUPIL Post	PUPIL Corr.	READING TEACHER Pre	READING TEACHER Post	READING TEACHER Corr.	MATH TEACHER Pre	MATH TEACHER Post	MATH TEACHER Corr.	COUNSELOR Pre	COUNSELOR Post	COUNSELOR Corr.
1. Learning things well.	50	3.8	3.4*	0.21	3.5	4.1**	0.29	3.0	2.5*	0.07	2.6	4.1**	0.28
2. Getting along well with others.	48	3.7	3.7*	0.20	3.2	3.4*	0.23	2.7	2.8	-0.07	2.8	3.7**	0.25
3. Taking directions from teachers.	50	3.4	3.3	0.47	3.2	3.3	0.41	2.8	2.5	0.21	2.7	3.7**	0.41
4. Getting my work in on time.	50	3.0	2.9	0.35	2.9	3.4*	0.30	2.7	2.4	0.25	2.5	3.7**	0.38
5. Remembering what I have learned.	50	3.4	3.2	0.28	3.4	3.8*	0.38	2.8	2.1**	0.32	2.5	3.7**	0.37
6. Controlling my temper.	40	3.4	3.4	0.26	3.1	3.2	-0.01	2.3	2.5	0.14	2.5	3.4**	0.34
7. Being willing to help others.	51	3.8	3.4	0.16	3.1	3.4*	0.37	2.8	2.7	0.21	2.5	3.4**	0.40
8. Paying attention to what teachers say.	51	3.5	3.3	0.12	3.0	3.0	0.43	2.7	2.6	0.15	2.5	3.5**	0.32
9. Wasting time in class.	43	2.9	2.7	0.69	2.9	2.9	0.54	2.3	1.9*	0.32	2.5	3.4**	0.41
10. Expecting everything I do to be right.	40	3.0	3.2	0.18	3.2	3.4	0.25	2.8	2.3**	0.34	2.7	3.9**	0.15
11. Getting better grades.	50	3.5	3.3	0.28	3.0	3.5*	0.44	2.5	2.2	0.38	2.4	3.5**	0.49
12. Having new ideas.	37	3.5	3.0*	0.18	3.0	3.2	0.35	2.3	2.3	0.49	2.2	3.3**	0.40
13. Being fair to others.	48	3.6	3.5	-0.02	3.1	3.2	0.59	2.7	2.5	-0.02	2.4	3.4**	0.25
14. Always making excuses for myself.	30	3.1	2.9	0.00	3.2	3.1	0.16	2.3	2.0	0.55	2.3	3.2**	0.29
15. Doing my school work on my own.	47	3.9	3.6	0.37	3.1	3.4	0.31	2.8	2.3*	0.23	2.4	3.3**	0.30
16. Reading as well as a student of my grade should.	48	3.2	3.1	0.48	2.7	3.1*	0.54	2.7	2.4	0.29	2.5	3.3**	0.20
17. Doing math problems by myself.	47	3.5	3.4	0.28	0.0	0.0	0.00	3.0	2.3**	0.12	2.4	3.3**	0.16

18. Saying words that are new to me.	43	3.2	3.6*	0.59*	3.3	3.6	0.54	2.3	2.3	-0.15	2.3	3.4**	0.19**
19. Discussing my ideas in class.	39	2.7	2.7	0.06	2.8	3.0	0.56	2.2	2.0	0.43	2.1	3.1**	0.20**
20. Writing clearly so that people can understand my ideas.	50	3.1	3.0	0.54	3.0	3.2	0.33	2.6	2.5	0.41	2.1	3.1**	0.33**
21. Understanding how to solve mathematical problems.	45	3.2	3.3	0.40	0.0	0.0	0.00	3.1	2.2**	0.15**	2.2	3.3**	0.27**
22. Not giving up on hard class work.	47	3.4	3.4	0.20	3.0	3.2	0.21	3.1	2.2**	0.17**	2.2	3.5**	0.41**
23. Respecting another person's opinion in class.	45	3.5	3.6	0.04	3.1	3.2	0.53	2.5	2.5	-0.02	2.2	3.5**	0.36**

Note.—Table 68 was based on Forms 103A and B. Statistical analysis was performed by a pre-post t computer program on an IBM System/360.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 69 — Mean Scores for Counseling Profile - Black Pupils

ITEM	Max. N	PUPIL Pre	PUPIL Post	PUPIL Corr.	READING TEACHER Pre	READING TEACHER Post	READING TEACHER Corr.	MATH TEACHER Pre	MATH TEACHER Post	MATH TEACHER Corr.	COUNSELOR Pre	COUNSELOR Post	COUNSELOR Corr.
1. Learning things well.	103	3.7	4.0*	0.20	2.9	3.5**	0.46	2.8	3.3**	0.34	3.4	3.9**	0.08
2. Getting along well with others.	98	3.8	3.9	0.01	3.2	3.5	0.12	3.0	3.1	0.30	3.3	3.4	0.16
3. Taking directions from teachers.	97	3.5	4.0**	0.23	3.0	3.6**	0.41	2.9	3.0	0.38	3.2	3.6*	0.14
4. Getting my work in on time.	103	3.4	3.3	0.21	2.7	3.2**	0.45	2.6	3.0**	0.45	2.9	3.4**	0.12
5. Remembering what I have learned.	100	3.5	3.5	0.27	2.9	3.5**	0.53	2.6	3.0**	0.54	3.1	3.7**	0.25
6. Controlling my temper.	87	3.5	3.6	0.17	2.9	3.3**	0.32	2.9	3.1	-0.03	2.8	3.3**	0.21
7. Being willing to help others.	91	3.9	3.8	0.46	3.0	3.3*	0.18	2.9	3.2**	0.30	3.0	3.3	0.06
8. Paying attention to what teachers say.	100	3.6	3.7	0.47	2.9	3.4**	0.39	2.7	2.9	0.31	3.1	3.4	0.04
9. Wasting time in class.	68	3.2	3.2	0.21	2.6	2.9*	0.44	2.5	2.5	0.33	2.8	2.9	-0.04
10. Expecting everything I do to be right.	61	3.4	3.4	0.13	3.1	3.2	0.30	2.5	2.9*	0.07	2.6	3.0	0.39
11. Getting better grades.	103	3.7	4.0	0.25	2.6	3.4**	0.45	2.7	3.0*	0.32	3.0	3.6**	0.24
12. Having new ideas.	86	3.8	3.7	0.44	2.3	2.5	0.35	2.6	3.1**	0.01	2.3	3.4**	0.39
13. Being fair to others.	91	3.7	3.6	0.36	3.1	3.2	0.36	3.0	3.0	0.40	2.9	3.2	0.11
14. Always making excuses for myself.	43	3.1	3.2	0.33	2.8	3.0	0.30	2.7	2.8	0.23	2.2	3.0**	0.32
15. Doing my school work on my own.	98	3.9	3.9	0.21	2.9	3.2	0.33	2.8	3.0	0.37	3.0	3.7**	0.18
16. Reading as well as a student of my grade should.	100	3.3	3.5	0.50	2.3	2.9**	0.67	2.9	2.9	0.64	2.1	3.2**	0.14
17. Doing math problems by myself.	95	3.9	3.8	0.17	0.0	0.0	0.00	2.7	3.0*	0.45	2.7	3.6**	0.10

18.	Saying words that are new to me.	97	3.4	3.8*	0.34	2.6	2.8	0.50	2.9	2.9	0.25	2.2	3.4**	0.01
19.	Discussing my ideas in class.	90	2.8	3.0	0.52	2.4	2.6	0.66	2.4	3.0**	0.10	2.1	3.1**	0.20
20.	Writing clearly so that people can understand my ideas.	94	3.6	3.6	0.46	2.3	2.9**	0.49	2.8	3.0	0.18	2.1	2.9**	0.04
21.	Understanding how to solve mathematical problems.	97	3.6	3.8	0.26	0.0	0.0	0.00	2.5	3.0**	0.49	2.8	3.6**	0.18
22.	Not giving up on hard class work.	96	0.22	3.4	0.22	2.9	3.3*	0.18	2.4	3.0**	0.27	2.9	3.5**	0.24
23.	Respecting another person's opinion in class.	83	3.7	3.9	0.54	3.1	3.2	0.18	2.9	3.1	0.04	3.0	3.5**	-0.06

Note.—Table 69 was based on Forms 103A and B. Statistical analysis was performed by a pre-post t computer program on the IBM System/360.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 70 — Mean Scores for Counseling Profile - All Pupils

	ITEM	Max. N	PUPIL Pre	PUPIL Post	PUPIL Corr.	READING TEACHER Pre	READING TEACHER Post	READING TEACHER Corr.	MATH TEACHER Pre	MATH TEACHER Post	MATH TEACHER Corr.	COUNSELOR Pre	COUNSELOR Post	COUNSELOR Corr.
1.	Learning things well.	153	3.7	3.8	0.19	3.1	3.7**	0.45	2.9	3.0	0.22	3.2	3.9**	0.09
2.	Getting along well with others.	146	3.8	3.8	0.08	3.2	3.5*	0.14	2.9	3.0	0.24	3.1	3.5**	0.15
3.	Taking directions from teachers.	147	3.5	3.7*	0.31	3.1	3.5**	0.40	2.9	2.8	0.32	3.1	3.6**	0.21
4.	Getting my work in on time.	153	3.3	3.1	0.27	2.7	3.3**	0.40	2.7	2.8	0.36	2.8	3.5**	0.17
5.	Remembering what I have learned.	150	3.5	3.4	0.27	3.0	3.6**	0.50	2.7	2.7	0.42	2.9	3.7**	0.27
6.	Controlling my temper.	127	3.4	3.5	0.20	3.0	3.2**	0.26	2.7	3.0*	0.08	2.7	3.3**	0.24
7.	Being willing to help others.	142	3.9	3.6	0.37	3.1	3.4**	0.21	2.9	3.1*	0.28	2.8	3.3**	0.22
8.	Paying attention to what teachers say.	151	3.6	3.6	0.37	2.9	3.3**	0.38	2.7	2.8	0.26	2.9	3.4**	0.10
9.	Wasting time in class.	111	3.1	3.0	0.40	2.7	2.9*	0.46	2.4	2.3	0.33	2.7	3.1**	0.08
10.	Expecting everything I do to be right.	101	3.2	3.3	0.16	3.1	3.3	0.29	2.6	2.6	0.13	2.6	3.4**	0.29
11.	Getting better grades.	153	3.7	3.7	0.26	2.8	3.4**	0.45	2.6	2.7	0.34	2.8	3.5**	0.31
12.	Having new ideas.	123	3.7	3.5	0.39	2.5	2.8	0.40	2.5	2.9**	0.18	2.2	3.4**	0.40
13.	Being fair to others.	139	3.7	3.6	0.25	3.1	3.2	0.41	2.9	2.9	0.35	2.7	3.3**	0.13
14.	Always making excuses for myself.	73	3.1	3.1	0.22	2.9	3.0	0.26	2.6	2.6	0.34	2.3	3.1**	0.31
15.	Doing my school work on my own.	145	3.9	3.8	0.25	3.0	3.3*	0.33	2.8	2.8	0.30	2.7	3.5**	0.25
16.	Reading as well as a student of my grade should.	148	3.3	3.4	0.49	2.4	3.0**	0.62	2.8	2.8	0.56	2.2	3.3**	0.16
17.	Doing math problems by myself.	142	3.7	3.7	0.22	0.0	0.0	0.00	2.8	2.8	0.28	2.6	3.4**	0.14

18. Saying words that are new to me.	140	3.4	3.7**	0.42	2.8	3.1*	0.55	2.8	2.8	0.26	2.3	3.4**	0,09
19. Discussing my ideas in class.	129	2.8	2.9	0.41	2.6	2.7	0.63	2.3	2.8**	0.19	2.1	3.1**	0.20
20. Writing clearly so that people can understand my ideas.	144	3.4	3.4	0.51	2.5	3.0**	0.46	2.8	2.9	0.25	2.1	3.0**	0.18
21. Understanding how to solve mathematical problems.	142	3.5	3.7	0.32	0.0	0.0	0.00	2.7	2.7	0.27	2.5	3.5**	0.23
22. Not giving up on hard class work.	143	3.4	3.4	0.22	2.9	3.3**	0.19	2.7	2.7	0.12	2.6	3.5**	0.27
23. Respecting another person's opinion in class.	128	3.6	3.8	0.41	3.1	3.2	0.24	2.9	3.0	0.08	2.6	3.5**	0.11

Note.—Table 70 was based on Forms 103A and B. Statistical analysis was performed by a pre-post t computer program on an IBM System/360.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 71 — Mean Scores[a] for Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC): Black Pupils, Junior High

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	136	29.2	29.3	0.47
Comparison	136	30.6	30.6	0.44
MY GRADES				
ESEA	136	28.7	28.0	0.32
Comparison	136	29.0	28.9	0.48
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	136	30.9	31.0	0.30
Comparison	136	31.8	32.1	0.44
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	136	24.5	24.4	0.25
Comparison	136	25.1	25.2	0.32
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	136	32.0	33.0	0.20
Comparison	136	34.0	33.6	0.22
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	136	29.2	30.4*	0.24
Comparison	136	30.4	29.8	0.41
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	136	21.8	23.1	0.48
Comparison	136	24.4	24.0	0.35
TEACHERS				
ESEA	136	27.3	27.5	0.34
Comparison	136	28.4	27.9	0.34
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	136	30.1	30.0	0.29
Comparison	136	30.7	31.3	0.35
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	136	22.9	22.8	0.46
Comparison	136	23.5	21.2**	0.33

Note.—Table 71 is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.
[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 72 — Mean Scores[a] for Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC): Brown Pupils, Junior High

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	96	26.6	28.1**	0.57
Comparison	95	27.8	27.2	0.51
MY GRADES				
ESEA	96	27.3	27.9	0.33
Comparison	95	27.8	27.3	0.35
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	96	29.3	30.5*	0.48
Comparison	95	30.2	29.7	0.31
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	96	27.3	28.7*	0.28
Comparison	95	25.6	25.4	0.51
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	96	31.7	32.4	0.27
Comparison	95	33.0	32.6	0.21
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	96	29.7	31.1*	0.31
Comparison	95	30.1	30.8	0.13
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	96	26.5	26.2	0.48
Comparison	95	24.2	24.7	0.46
TEACHERS				
ESEA	96	29.1	27.6	0.29
Comparison	95	28.6	27.4	0.48
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	96	30.8	31.0	0.27
Comparison	95	30.9	31.0	0.31
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	96	27.6	25.7*	0.20
Comparison	95	26.9	25.0*	0.49

Note.—Table 72 is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.
[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.
*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 73 — Mean Scores[a] for Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC): All Pupils

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	232	28.2	28.8*	0.53
Comparison	231	29.5	29.2	0.53
MY GRADES				
ESEA	232	28.1	28.0	0.32
Comparison	231	28.5	28.3	0.44
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	232	30.3	30.8	0.38
Comparison	231	31.1	31.1	0.41
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	232	25.6	26.2	0.31
Comparison	231	25.3	25.3	0.39
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	232	31.9	32.7*	0.22
Comparison	231	33.6	33.2	0.23
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	232	29.4	30.7**	0.26
Comparison	231	30.3	30.2	0.31
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	232	23.8	24.4	0.51
Comparison	231	24.3	24.3	0.39
TEACHERS				
ESEA	232	28.1	27.6	0.32
Comparison	231	28.5	27.6	0.39
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	232	30.4	30.4	0.29
Comparison	231	30.8	31.2	0.33
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	232	24.8	24.0	0.41
Comparison	231	24.9	22.8**	0.42

Note.—Table 73 is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless; honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

*Significant at .05 level.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 74 — Mean Scores[a] for Quick Measure of Concepts (QMOC): Black Pupils, Senior High

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
ME				
ESEA	20	30.8	32.4	0.33
Comparison	9	32.1	31.9	-0.01
MY GRADES				
ESEA	20	32.9	31.8	0.43
Comparison	9	28.4	25.7	-0.06
MY FUTURE				
ESEA	20	30.8	32.3	0.36
Comparison	9	34.9	34.5	0.44
MY CLASSMATES				
ESEA	20	25.3	26.6	0.19
Comparison	9	23.6	24.8	-0.24
PERSON I'D LIKE TO BE				
ESEA	20	33.0	33.5	0.63
Comparison	9	34.8	33.5	-0.32
MY BEST FRIENDS				
ESEA	20	30.8	28.8	0.72
Comparison	9	28.2	30.4	0.44
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA	20	26.0	26.4	0.65
Comparison	9	23.3	22.5	0.46
TEACHERS				
ESEA	20	30.1	30.0	0.55
Comparison	9	28.6	27.0	-0.28
COUNSELORS				
ESEA	20	30.9	32.7	0.60
Comparison	9	30.5	33.4	0.10
MY SCHOOL				
ESEA	20	26.1	25.6	0.72
Comparison	9	25.7	20.7	0.39

Note.—Table 74 is based on Form 103C. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Highest possible score per concept was 36. Scores on each of the 10 concepts rated in QMOC were based on a 6-point continuum scale for each of the following six qualities: kind--cruel; good--bad; fair--unfair; valuable--worthless honest--dishonest; pleasant--unpleasant.

Table 75 — Secondary School Physician's Report

ITEM	TOTAL	ITEM	TOTAL
Routine examinations	4290	Parent conferences	344
Special referrals	1063	Other conferences	112
Health inspections	266	Home notices	1762
Athletic inspections	1	Faculty lectures	2
Driver training	0	P. T. A. lectures	2
First aid	249	Pupil lectures	8
Faculty conferences	307	Sanitary inspections	5

CONDITIONS FOUND	Correction Needed	Recheck	Under Private or Clinical Care
Malnutrition	88	15	0
Obesity	145	27	2
Defective vision	339	123	21
Defective hearing	176	89	18
Eye diseases	43	6	7
Ear diseases	221	230	9
Throat diseases	274	41	21
Gingivitis	54	1	2
Dental caries	1175	46	125
Malocclusion	132	103	17
Blood disorder	8	21	4
Lymphatic disorder	19	0	1
Organic heart	20	7	8
Questionable heart	94	126	5
Chest diseases	105	11	17
Chest deformities	27	10	1
Postural defects	265	245	1
Foot defects	172	223	3
Orthopedic miscellaneous	48	30	10
Neurological diseases	55	4	13
Emotional disorders	193	31	17
Psychosomatic disorders	42	43	1
Speech defects	76	82	8
CD reportable	3	8	9
CD non-reportable	23	6	1
Skin communicable	44	9	4
Skin non-communicable	113	12	7
G. U. disorders	12	2	4
Gonadal defects	17	3	1
Gyn disorders	3	0	0
Diabetes	3	1	2
Other metabolic	5	1	1
Hernia, all types	76	28	5
Congenital defects	22	6	4
Cyesis	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	198	33	7

Note.—Table 75 is based on Form 33.6, Health Services Branch.

Table 76 — Secondary School Nurse's Report

ITEM	TOTAL
Readmissions	5153
Exclusions	3571
Pupil conferences	7852
Parent conferences	3648
School personnel conferences	4729
Case conferences	2171
Health education (formal)	115
First aid	8274
Referrals	3567
Number of pupils with defects reported	5188
Number of pupils with defects followed up	2806
Number of pupils with defects corrected	1554
Home visits	418
Pupils processed other than readmissions, exclusions and first aid	13294
Vision screened	4885
Immunizations	63

Note.—Table 76 is based on Form 33.182 (Revised), Division of Special Services, Health Resource Unit - Nursing Section.

Table 77 — PSA Worker's Report

ITEM	FREQUENCY
Interview with pupil	346
Interview with parent	621
Interview with others	345
Case conference consultant	20
Agency contact referral	24
Special reports	3
Phone call—home	294
Home call—no response	83

Note.—Table 77 is based on Form 34-EH-5. Maximum N = 5.

Table 78 — Mean Scores[a] For Intergroup Measure of Concepts (IMOC)

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
MY EDUCATION				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	40.7	40.2	.50
ESEA - Hawaii	9	38.0	38.1	.27
Comparison	75	40.1	38.4*	.56
MY COUNTRY				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	33.8	32.5	.47
ESEA - Hawaii	9	36.3	35.8	.64
Comparison	75	33.6	32.9	.52
MEXICAN AMERICANS (CHICANO, BROWN)				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	33.1	34.1	.44
ESEA - Hawaii	9	35.3	34.0	-.40
Comparison	75	33.7	34.2	.48
MOST PEOPLE				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	34.5	34.7	.40
ESEA - Hawaii	9	34.8	35.7	.75
Comparison	75	34.1	34.7	.53
AFRO-AMERICANS (BLACKS, NEGROES)				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	36.7	36.1	.53
ESEA - Hawaii	9	36.7	34.6	.52
Comparison	75	35.7	36.5	.66
MY NEIGHBORHOOD				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	37.0	35.5	.48
ESEA - Hawaii	9	36.3	32.3	.47
Comparison	75	34.0	33.5	.73
MY FREEDOM				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	36.8	37.5	.37
ESEA - Hawaii	9	41.0	36.6	.45
Comparison	75	40.9	40.0	.53
ORIENTALS				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	34.9	35.5	.33
ESEA - Hawaii	9	36.7	36.9	.13
Comparison	75	37.6	37.0	.53
MYSELF				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	41.0	41.0	.47
ESEA - Hawaii	9	40.0	41.0	-.13
Comparison	75	40.3	39.4	.59
MY FUTURE				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	41.9	41.5	.41
ESEA - Hawaii	9	39.9	39.9	-.05
Comparison	75	42.4	41.0*	.53

Continued

Table 78 — Continued

CONCEPT AND GROUP	N	PRE	POST	CORRELATION
MY CULTURE				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	40.0	39.3	.39
ESEA - Hawaii	9	35.4	37.3	.22
Comparison	75	37.6	37.5	.34
ANGLOS (WHITES)				
ESEA - School Exchange	105	32.6	36.4**	.35
ESEA - Hawaii	9	33.0	35.1	.30
Comparison	75	36.0	36.6	.57

Note.—Table 78 is based on Form 105A. Statistical analysis was performed by Pre-Post t Concept Comparison computer program on an IBM System/360.
[a]Highest possible score per concept was 60. Scores on each of the 12 concepts rated in IMOC were based on a 5-point continuum scale for the following 16 paired qualities, 10 of which were specially selected for each concept: fast--slow; fair--unfair; good--bad; equal--unequal; helpful--harmful; honest--dishonest; strong--weak; pleasant--unpleasant; valuable--worthless; desirable--undesirable; right--wrong; desegregated--segregated; kind--cruel; happy--sad; beautiful--ugly; advantaged--disadvantaged.
*Significant at .05.
**Significant at .01.

Table 79 — Median Ratings[a] of SAC by Parents

ITEM	Parents at Four or More Meetings (N=40)	Parents at Three or Less Meetings (N=88)	All Parents (N=128)
1. My child reads better this year than last.	4.4	4.1	4.2
2. He cannot do math problems by himself.	1.9[b]	2.0[b]	2.0[b]
3. My child seems to know his strengths and weaknesses in schoolwork.	4.0	4.1	4.1
4. He shows interest in trying to improve his weaknesses in learning.	4.2	4.2	4.2
5. I have not been invited to SAC parent meetings.	1.8[b]	2.2[b]	2.2[b]
6. I have received written information about the SAC program.	4.2	4.1	4.1
7. I have visited my child's SAC class this year.	4.2	3.9	4.0
8. My child gets better instruction in SAC than when he was in the regular program.	4.3	4.1	4.2
9. My child has had a recent health examination by the school doctor.	3.0	3.8	3.7
10. I find my child likes school more now.	4.0	4.0	4.0
11. I think it's good for our schoolchildren to meet with children of different ethnic or cultural backgrounds.	4.3	4.5	4.4
12. My child has attended several of these activities (item 11) with his SAC classmates.	3.9	3.6	3.7
13. The SAC parent meetings I have attended have not been helpful.	2.0[b]	2.0[b]	2.0[b]
14. My child has had a recent dental examination by the school dentist.	3.9	3.7	3.8
15. I feel that the SAC teachers are well trained.	4.1	4.1	4.1

Continued

Table 79 — Continued

ITEM	Parents at Four or More Meetings (N=40)	Parents at Three or Less Meetings (N=88)	All Parents (N=128)
16. School staff asked me for my opinion about how to spend next year's money for SAC at my child's school.	4.1	3.7	3.9
17. The classrooms being used now for the SAC program at my child's school are very inadequate.	3.4[b]	3.0[b]	3.1[b]
18. I wish community people had a bigger part in planning ESEA Title I programs.	4.3	4.1	4.2
19. My child tells me that the teacher aide in the classroom is helpful.	4.3	4.2	4.2
20. He says that he does not like to talk to his counselor.	2.3[b]	2.2[b]	2.3[b]
21. Someone from the SAC program has come to my home to talk to me about my child.	2.2	2.1	2.1
22. The people in the SAC program are very helpful to parents.	4.2	4.0	4.1
23. Since September, I have visited my child's school about _____ (number) times for SAC parent meetings and talks with teachers, counselors, and others. (Median number of visits:)	4.4	4.2	4.2

Note.—Table 79 is based on Form 102A. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Ratings were based on a 1-5 scale: 0 = does not apply, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree -- no, 3 = neither agree nor disagree -- no opinion, 4 = agree -- yes, 5 = strongly agree.

[b]The negative wording of this item reverses the direction of the 1-5 scale; the lower the median rating, the more it favors the program.

Table 80 — Median Rating of Prescriptive Teaching

ITEM	TEACHER RATING[a] BY SELF Pre	Post	Diff.	BY CEC Pre	Post	Diff.	EDUCATIONAL AIDE RATING[a] BY SELF Pre	Post	Diff.	BY CEC Pre	Post	Diff.
1. I communicate personally with the home (other than school notices).	3.1	3.2	.1	3.4	4.0	.6	2.8	2.9	.1	3.3	3.8	.5
2. I utilize a variety of learning activities.	4.4	4.6	.2	4.2	4.3	.1	4.3	4.2	-.1	3.7	4.0	.3
3. I try to provide continuity to the prescriptive teaching program.	4.0	4.2	.2	4.3	4.6	.3	3.7	3.9	.2	4.1	4.1	.0
4. I attend prescriptive teaching workshops weekly.	3.0	2.9	-.1	3.5	4.1	.6	3.0	3.6	.6	3.1	3.9	.8
5. I spend the majority of class time giving individual instruction.	4.0	4.1	.1	4.1	4.3	.2	4.1	4.4	.3	3.9	4.3	.4
6. I utilize teacher-made diagnostic tests.	3.9	3.7	-.2	4.0	4.2	.2	4.0	4.4	.4	4.0	4.1	.1
7. I build rapport with my pupils.	4.6	4.7	.1	4.5	4.6	.1	4.7	4.5	-.2	4.4	4.7	.3
8. I use behavioral objectives.	4.1	4.2	.1	3.9	3.8	-.1	4.0	4.3	.3	3.3	3.7	.4
9. I confer frequently with pupils on learning difficulties.	4.4	4.5	.1	4.2	4.6	.4	4.6	4.8	.2	4.0	4.4	.4
10. I give remediation exercises to help solve individual deficiencies.	4.3	4.2	-.1	4.1	4.6	.5	4.0	4.1	.1	3.9	4.3	.4

11.	I maintain a statistical record of each pupil's achievement scores.	4.5	4.6	.1	4.5	4.8	.3	4.4	4.6	.2	4.3	4.6	.3
12.	I grade the individual against himself (not against other pupils).	4.4	4.6	.2	4.2	4.7	.5	4.7	4.8	.1	4.2	4.6	.4
13.	I motivate each pupil so he works well independently.	3.9	3.9	.0	4.0	4.3	.3	4.3	4.3	.0	3.6	4.2	.6
14.	I try to help all my pupils achieve at the same rate every day.[b]	1.3	1.3	.0	2.5	2.2	-.3	1.5	1.3	-.2	2.7	2.2	-.5
15.	I give individual pre- and posttests in specific achievement skills.	3.9	4.0	.1	4.3	4.6	.3	3.8	4.4	.6	4.0	4.3	.3
16.	I make sure each pupil is aware of his goals in each task.	4.2	4.3	.1	4.2	4.5	.3	4.3	4.4	.1	4.0	4.3	.3
17.	I provide separate centers for group activities.	3.8	3.5	-.3	4.0	4.2	.2	3.7	3.9	.2	3.8	4.1	.3
18.	I praise individual pupils for their efforts.	4.7	4.8	.1	4.6	4.7	.1	4.9	4.8	-.1	4.6	4.8	.2
	MEAN MEDIAN	3.9	4.0	.1	4.0	4.3	.3	3.9	4.1	.2	3.8	4.1	.3
	Percentage Score[c]	78%	80%		80%	86%		78%	82%		76%	82%	
		N=77	N=71		N=81	N=81		N=63	N=66		N=76	N=75	

Note.—Table 80 is based on Form 101F. Maximum N is shown at the foot of each column. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Ratings were based on a scale calibrated 1-5: never = 1, seldom = 2, sometimes = 3, usually = 4, always = 5.

[b]This item was a validity check, and should have been rated low by the careful rater since it described a condition untenable in prescriptive teaching.

[c]Percentage Score derived by multiplying mean median value by 20 (20 points per unit on the 1-5 scale; total possible, 100%).

Table 81 — Median Ratings of Compensatory Education Coordinators

ITEM	Pre-Post Difference by Raters[a]							Total (Mean Median)		
	Prin. N=15	Vice Prin. N=21	Head Couns. N=15	Comp. Ed. Coord. N=13	Certif. Staff N=89	Class. Staff N=31	Ed. Aide III N=71	Pre N=237	Post N=253	Diff.
Rate the ability your Compensatory Education Coordinator has demonstrated:										
1. to plan effectively.	.2	.3	.8	.5	-.4	-.1	-.1	4.0	4.2	.2
2. for leadership by example.	.0	.1	.2	.0	-.5	.1	-.1	4.2	4.2	.0
3. to make impartial decisions.	.1	.3	.5	.3	-.4	-.1	.0	4.1	4.2	.1
4. to stimulate improved teaching.	.6	.3	2.1	.1	-.5	-.4	.1	3.7	4.0	.3
5. in handling personnel problems.	-.3	.4	.6	-.2	-.4	-.2	.0	4.0	4.0	.0
6. in chairing public meetings.	.6	.0	-.3	.3	-.2	.0	.4	4.2	4.3	.1
7. to meet deadlines.	.2	.3	.0	.0	-.2	-.8	.0	4.3	4.2	-.1
8. in the use of test results.	.4	-.1	1.8	.7	-.5	.2	.0	3.7	4.1	.4
9. to guide the counseling program.	.4	.0	.9	.4	-.6	.0	-.2	3.9	4.0	.1
10. in handling pupil discipline.	.7	.4	-.7	-.1	-.4	-.1	.0	4.2	4.2	.0
11. to conduct inservice meetings.	.6	.2	.8	.1	-.3	-.3	-.3	4.1	4.2	.1
12. to work well with total ESEA staff.	.2	.0	1.1	.0	-.3	-.1	.3	4.1	4.3	.2
13. to keep total faculty aware of the positive effects of the ESEA program.	-.1	-.2	.6	.2	-.6	-.2	-.1	4.0	3.9	-.1
Rate the Compensatory Education Coordinator's:										
14. dedication to the ESEA program.	.3	.3	.0	.1	-.2	-.3	.1	4.6	4.6	.0
15. comprehensive, knowledge of the program, compared to that of those supervised.	.4	.3	.9	.5	.0	.3	.1	3.9	4.3	.4
Total (Mean Median)	.3	.2	.6	.2	-.4	-.1	.0	4.1	4.2	.1

Note.—Table 81 is based on Form 101E. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Ratings were based on a 1-5 scale: poor = 1, fair = 2, average = 3, good = 4, excellent = 5.

Table 82 —SAC Compensatory Education Coordinator Ratings in Rank Order

Coordinator, Rank Order[b]	Rater N	Median[a] for All Items Pre	Post	Diff.
1	27	4.5	2.8	-1.7
2	14	4.2	3.3	- .9
3	19	4.2	3.5	- .7
4	15	3.2	2.9	- .3
5	12	3.8	3.5	- .3
6	16	4.4	4.1	- .3
7	15	4.7	4.6	- .1
8	25	4.5	4.6	.1
9	13	4.1	4.2	.1
10	14	3.5	3.7	.2
11	16	4.6	4.8	.2
12	13	2.9	3.2	.3
13	16	3.8	4.1	.3
14	15	3.3	3.7	.4
15	15	4.1	4.5	.4
16	15	3.6	4.2	.6
17	Not reported due to change of CEC at mid-year.			
Mean Median		4.0	3.9	

Note.—Table 82 is based on Form 101E. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Ratings were based on a 1-5 scale: poor = 1, fair = 2, average = 3, good = 4, excellent = 5.

[b]Lowest-rated first, highest-rated last, as established by pre-post differences shown in last column.

Table 83 — SAC Certificated Staff, Personnel Information

ITEM	PERCENTAGE
Sex:	
Male	36%
Female	64
Age:	
30 years	42
31-50	50
50+	8
Ethnicity:	
Black and Brown	34
Other	66
Degrees:	
Bachelor's	74
Master's	25
Experience of less than 6 years:	
in teaching profession	53
with Los Angeles Unified School District	70
in present position	77
Prior experience in subject (SAC teachers):	
English	20
Mathematics	7
Status:	
Probationary II, III, and tenured	70
Probationary I	12
Substitute	12
Intern	3
Other	3

Note.—Table 83 is based on Los Angeles Unified School District personnel records. Maximum N = 86. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

Table 84 — Pupil Evaluation of SAC

ITEM	MEDIAN RATINGS[a] Black N=343	Brown N=270	All N=613
1. My reading has improved more rapidly in my SAC class than when I was in a regular class.	3.9	3.9	3.9
2. If I had my choice I'd like to be back in a regular English class.	2.3[b]	2.7[b]	2.4[b]
3. I understand math better now because of the way it's taught in my SAC class.	3.8	4.0	3.9
4. The aide in our SAC room gives me a lot of help.	3.9	4.1	4.0
5. I don't like being in a small class with both a teacher and an aide.	1.9[b]	2.4[b]	2.1[b]
6. I feel our intergroup activities have helped me understand other ethnic groups better.	3.9	3.7	3.8
7. My parents like the SAC program.	3.8	3.7	3.8
8. My SAC counselor has helped me very much.	3.6	3.6	3.6
9. I have been examined this year by the school doctor.	2.3	3.4	2.6
10. Someone from SAC came to my house to talk with my parents.	1.9	1.9	1.9
11. My parents do not help me with my homework.	2.5[b]	2.8[b]	2.6[b]
12. The school dentist examined my teeth.	3.6	4.1	3.8
13. One of my parents has visited school this year.	3.9	3.6	3.8
14. I know what kind of schoolwork I do best.	4.5	4.2	4.3
15. If I want to do better schoolwork, it's all up to me.	4.7	4.6	4.7

Note.—Table 84 is based on Form 101H. Max. N is shown at the head of each column. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Ratings were based on a scale calibrated 1-5: strongly disagree = 1; disagree—no = 2; neither agree nor disagree—neutral = 3; agree—yes = 4; strongly agree = 5.

[b]The negative wording of this item has reversed the direction of the 1-5 scale; the lower the median rating, the more it favors the program.

Table 85 — Median Ratings[a] of SAC Program

CATEGORY AND ITEM	POSITION OF RATER: Central Office Staff[b] N=1/7	Comp. Ed. Coord. N=14/17	SAC Aux. Services Staff N=19/33	SAC Class. Staff N=15/34	SAC Ed. Aide III N=31/94	SAC Teach. Staff N=53/96	SAC School Admin. N=13/72	SAC Zone Staff N=2/7	TOTAL (Mean Median) N=148/360
Reading and Arithmetic									
1. SAC pupils are learning at a faster rate than non-SAC pupils.	0.0	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.0	3.7
8. The use of prescriptive techniques has greatly improved SAC teaching.	0.0	3.9	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.6	4.5	3.9
10. Most SAC teachers did not use prescriptive teaching this year.	0.0	2.1[c]	2.8[c]	1.8[c]	2.4[c]	2.3[c]	2.3[c]	2.5[c]	2.3[c]
13. Most SAC teachers do not know what prescriptive teaching is.	0.0	3.0[c]	2.4[c]	1.8[c]	2.3[c]	2.0[c]	1.7[c]	2.0[c]	2.1[c]
15. Most of the teachers I know did not have the reading handbook and did not use it.	0.0	2.7[c]	2.7[c]	3.0[c]	2.8[c]	2.5[c]	2.4[c]	4.0[c]	2.7[c]
16. Many of the teachers I know did have the reading handbook and did use it.	0.0	3.5	3.4	3.0	3.4	2.8	3.3	2.5	3.1
17. The handbook is irrelevant for the reading needs of inner city pupils.	0.0	2.1[c]	2.6[c]	2.7[c]	2.7[c]	2.6[c]	2.3[c]	3.0[c]	2.6[c]
18. I made some use of the handbook during this school year.	0.0	4.2	3.5	2.5	3.9	3.9	3.0	3.0	3.8
19. Most of the teachers I know did not have the math handbook and did not use it.	0.0	3.0[c]	2.6[c]	2.5[c]	2.9[c]	2.3[c]	2.8[c]	2.5[c]	2.6[c]

20. Many of the teachers I know did have the math handbook and did use it.	0.0	4.0	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.1	2.5	3.4
21. The handbook is irrelevant for the math needs of inner city pupils.	0.0	2.0[c]	2.6[c]	2.5[c]	2.6[c]	2.6[c]	2.5[c]	2.5[c]	2.5[c]
22. I made some use of the math handbook during this school year.	0.0	3.8	3.0	1.8	3.0	4.0	3.3	3.0	3.5
Staff									
6. Compensatory education coordinators are administrative interns.	5.0	2.3	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	4.1	4.5	3.7
9. SAC reading and arithmetic coordinators should teach at least four periods per day.	0.0	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.5	4.0
14. Every SAC teacher in my school is at least a "Prob. 2" and teaches five SAC classes.	0.0	3.5	2.4	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.7	4.0	3.5
People in the following categories have demonstrated an excellent working knowledge of the total SAC program:									
23. central office staff	4.0	3.8	4.1	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.5	3.5
24. compensatory education coordinator	1.0	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.5	4.2
27. SAC classified staff	0.0	3.7	3.6	4.4	4.3	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.9
29. SAC education aide III	3.0	3.5	3.7	4.4	4.6	3.9	4.1	3.5	4.1
31. SAC teaching staff	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.2	3.5	4.2
32. school administrators	1.0	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.3	4.1	2.5	3.5
33. zone staff	1.0	4.3	3.3	4.3	3.6	3.2	3.3	2.5	3.4

Continued

Table 85 — Continued

CATEGORY AND ITEM	POSITION OF RATER: Central Office Staff N=1/7[b]	Comp. Ed. Coord. N=14/17	SAC Aux. Services Staff N=19/33	SAC Class. Staff N=15/34	SAC Ed. Aide III N=31/94	SAC Teach. Staff N=53/96	SAC School Admin. N=13/72	SAC Zone Staff N=2/7	TOTAL (Mean Median) N=148/360
ESEA									
7. The federal ESEA-I guidelines do not have the force of law for a District as large as ours.	4.0[c]	3.5[c]	3.4[c]	2.9[c]	3.3[c]	2.9[c]	1.9[c]	3.5[c]	3.0[c]
11. Each SAC school received a spring-semester minigrant of surplus ESEA-I funds to help strengthen its program.	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.3	4.0	4.1
12. Of the nearly $21 million in ESEA-I funds awarded to the District this year, secondary schools received around $3.5 million.	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.6	3.5	3.3
Evaluation									
Individuals in the following positions have made practical use of these evaluative materials and services for the purpose of program improvement:									
47. central office staff	0.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.2	3.0	3.1
48. compensatory education coordinator	0.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.2	4.0	3.0	3.7
50. SAC classified staff	0.0	3.0	3.2	3.9	4.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.3
51. SAC education aide III	0.0	3.0	3.1	4.0	4.1	3.2	3.6	3.0	3.5
52. SAC teaching staff	0.0	3.8	4.1	3.5	4.0	3.6	4.1	3.0	3.8
53. school administrators	0.0	2.7	2.9	3.5	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.0	3.2
54. zone staff	0.0	3.0	2.9	3.5	3.4	3.0	3.2	2.5	3.1

Staff Development

5.	The quality of inservice for SAC staff is better this year than in past years.	3.0	2.4	3.1	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.5	3.0
In my opinion, people in the following positions have been very helpful in providing in-service education for the areas named:										
Prescriptive teaching:										
34.	compensatory education coordinator	1.0	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.6	3.7	3.0	3.3
35.	reading/arithmetic coordinator	3.0	3.1	3.5	4.3	4.1	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.6
36.	zone staff	1.0	2.0	3.0	3.4	3.3	2.7	2.8	3.5	2.9
Intergroup relations:										
37.	central staff	4.0	2.2	2.5	3.4	3.1	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.8
38.	compensatory education coordinator	1.0	3.0	3.8	3.7	4.1	2.9	3.8	3.0	3.5
39.	zone staff	1.0	2.3	2.5	3.3	3.3	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.8
Auxiliary Services:										
40.	central office staff	4.0	2.1	4.3	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.3	3.0	3.1
41.	compensatory education coordinator	1.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.0	3.7
42.	consulting counselor	4.0	2.0	4.1	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.6	3.0	3.4
43.	PSA counselor	3.0	2.2	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.1	3.8	3.0	3.3
44.	SAC counselor	3.0	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.1	3.6	3.8	3.0	3.8
45.	SAC nurse	3.0	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.8
46.	zone staff	1.0	2.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	2.8	2.9	4.5	3.0

Continued

Table 85 — Continued

CATEGORY AND ITEM	Central Office Staff N=1/7[b]	Comp. Ed. Coord. N=14/17	SAC Aux. Services Staff N=19/33	SAC Class. Staff N=15/34	SAC Ed. Aide III N=31/94	SAC Teach. Staff N=53/96	SAC School Admin. N=13/72	SAC Zone Staff N=2/7	TOTAL (Mean Median) N=148/360
	POSITION OF RATER								
Auxiliary Services									
3. SAC pupils are receiving more counseling than non-SAC pupils.	0.0	4.9	4.8	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.7	3.0	4.5
People in the following categories have demonstrated an excellent working knowledge of the total SAC program:									
25. consulting counselor	4.0	3.9	4.6	4.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.9
26. PSA counselor	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.3	3.6	3.4	4.1	3.5	3.8
28. SAC counselor	4.0	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.5	4.3
30. SAC nurse	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.3	3.9	4.1	3.5	4.1
Individuals in the following positions have made practical use of these evaluative materials and services for the purpose of program improvement:									
49. SAC auxiliary services staff	0.0	3.5	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.4
In my opinion, individuals in the following categories have demonstrated an excellent working knowledge of the educational strengths and weaknesses found in SAC pupils:									
55. arithmetic teacher	0.0	4.0	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.5	4.2
56. consulting counselor	0.0	3.3	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.8
57. reading teacher	0.0	4.3	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.3

58. SAC counselor	0.0	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.5	4.2
It has been my experience this year that pupil behavior was noticeably improved after pupils had been counseled by the:									
59. consulting counselor	0.0	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.6	3.2	3.1	5.0	3.5
60. PSA counselor	0.0	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.2	3.2	3.5	4.0	3.4
61. SAC counselor	0.0	4.7	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.0	3.9	5.0	4.1
The following staff members, in my opinion, have been most helpful in providing health services for pupils needing them:									
62. SAC dentist	0.0	1.4	1.3	4.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	0.0	3.1
63. SAC doctor	0.0	1.0	3.5	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.2	0.0	3.0
64. SAC nurse	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.1	5.0	4.6
This year, more than last, parents of the SAC pupils are interacting more frequently with these staff members:									
65. community aide	0.0	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.2	3.5	4.2	3.5	4.0
66. compensatory education coordinator	0.0	4.7	4.6	4.3	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.9
67. consulting counselor	0.0	2.6	4.1	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.3	4.0	3.3
68. PSA counselor	0.0	3.3	4.2	4.3	3.3	3.1	4.1	4.0	3.5
69. SAC counselor	0.0	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.2
70. SAC teachers	0.0	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1

Table 85 — Continued

CATEGORY AND ITEM	POSITION OF RATER: Central Office Staff N=1/7[b]	Comp. Ed. Coord. N=14/17	SAC Aux. Services Staff N=19/33	SAC Class. Staff N=15/34	SAC Ed. Aide III N=31/94	SAC Teach. Staff N=53/96	SAC School Admin. N=13/72	SAC Zone Staff N=2/7	TOTAL (Mean Median) N=148/360
This year, more than last, these staff members have made more community contacts:									
71. community aide	0.0	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.6	3.6	4.2	0.0	4.3
72. compensatory education coordinator	0.0	4.7	4.5	4.4	3.7	3.4	4.0	4.0	3.9
73. consulting counselor	0.0	2.6	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.2	2.8	4.0	3.3
74. PSA counselor	0.0	3.4	4.6	4.6	3.3	3.2	3.9	4.0	3.5
75. SAC counseling intern	0.0	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.3
76. SAC counselor	0.0	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.2	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.1
77. SAC teachers	0.0	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0

Note.—Table 85 is based on Form 101G. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

[a]Ratings were based on a 1-5 scale: 0 = does not apply, 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree; neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

[b]First N is number of raters reporting; second N is number receiving form.

[c]The negative wording of the item reverses the direction of the 1-5 scale; the lower the median rating, the more it favors the program.

Table 86 — Minigrant Workshop Ratings by Parents
(May 1971, Harte Jr. High School)

ITEM	OMITS	NO	YES
As a result of more contact with the school, I have:			
1. assisted my child with reading assignments	10	5	75
2. assisted my child with math assignments	11	13	65
3. assisted in the instructional program at school	20	40	29
4. influenced other parents to be volunteers in the instructional program	19	33	37
5. attended advisory committee meetings	16	23	50

ITEM	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
	Omits	Waste of time 1	Not Helpful 2	Un-certain 3	Helpful 4	Very Helpful 5	
Please rate the following sessions that you attended today.							
6. Human relations	8	0	1	2	11	67	4.9
7. Developing Title I programs	12	1	1	4	28	43	4.6
8. Counseling services	8	0	1	2	16	62	4.9
9. Budgeting	14	3	1	7	27	37	4.5
10. Evaluation	8	3	0	3	29	46	4.6
11. Speakers	10	0	2	2	19	56	4.8
12. Discussions	9	0	0	0	19	61	4.8

Note.—Table 86 is based on Form 102C. Maximum N = 89. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.

Table 87 — Parent Involvement Ratings, Minigrant

ITEM[a]	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
	Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	
Based on my experience with the ESEA Parent Involvement components:							
11. I have more understanding of my child's needs.	4	3	0	1	81	94	4.6
12. I am better able to help my child with homework and assignments.	11	2	11	12	91	56	4.2
13. I still cannot help with mathematics assignments.	37	14	69	16	38	9	2.4[b]
14. I give my child help with his homework at least once a week.	20	3	13	2	104	41	4.1
15. I have learned much from the volunteer instructional program at school.	16	2	9	3	80	73	4.4
16. I have not been able to attend any instructional programs at my child's school.	47	12	68	4	39	13	2.3[b]
17. Working with the Advisory Committee has helped me understand better the differences of opinion between parents.	36	2	6	8	66	65	4.4
18. I would like to be a member of the Advisory Committee. (Answer only if you are <u>not</u> a member.)	85	0	16	9	59	14	3.9
19. I feel the school and parents are cooperating more than they have in the past.	9	2	4	11	95	62	4.2
20. I think this program expects parents to do the work of the schools.	24	29	92	17	14	7	2.1[b]

Continued

Table 87 — Continued

	ITEM	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
		Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	
21.	I believe that my active interest in my child's education will help him learn.	9	0	1	0	78	95	4.6
22.	I have assisted with the school's volunteer program at least twice a month.	43	1	54	5	53	27	3.7
23.	My enthusiasm has influenced other parents to become volunteers in the instructional program at school.	39	0	33	22	65	24	3.8
24.	I feel the schools are not doing as much as they could to help our children get a better education.	24	15	50	30	37	27	3.0[b]
25.	I feel my child does not like to have me around his school.	29	31	77	10	20	16	2.1[b]
26.	I feel my child has shown more interest in school this year.	20	0	15	13	78	57	4.2
27.	I have attended at least half of the Advisory Committee meetings.	37	0	54	3	62	27	3.8

Note.—Table 87 is based on Form 102D. Maximum N = 183. Statistical analysis was performed by a Fortran Tally and Analyze computer program on an IBM System/360.
[a]Numbers 1-10 reserved for office use.
[b]The negative wording of this item reverses the direction of the 1-5 scale; the lower the median rating, the more it favors the program.

Table 88 — Pupil Ratings of SAC, Minigrant

	ITEM[a]	FREQUENCY						MEDIAN
		Does Not Apply 0	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	
7.	My parents like the SAC program.	31	11	5	65	47	52	3.7
10.	Someone from SAC came to my house to talk to my parents.	36	67	64	11	19	15	1.8
11.	My parents do not help me with my homework.	11	60	39	26	45	33	2.6[b]
13.	One of my parents has visited the school this year.	11	30	35	6	62	65	3.9

Note.—Table 88 is based on Form 101H. Maximum N = 221. Statistics were calculated by hand.

[a]Missing items do not pertain to this evaluation.

[b]The negative wording of this item reverses the direction of the 1-5 scale; the lower the median rating, the more it favors the program.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL COMPONENTS

INSTRUCTION

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

TABLES

INSTRUCTION

Reading Abstract

Pupils	1269
Nonpublic Schools	32
Teachers	36
Aides	0
Approximate Cost	$538,380

DESCRIPTION: The reading component in the nonpublic schools (NPS) provided individual remedial instruction in reading and language to small groups of children. The reading approaches used were individual, linguistic, phonetic, kinesthetic, language experience, and basal reading. The primary reading program included grades two and three; the intermediate program, grades four, five, and six; and the middle school program, grades seven and eight.

Pupil selection for grades two through six was based on available test information and the recommendations of the principal and teachers. The children were grouped according to age, reading ability, and proficiency in English. The initial selection of pupils in grades seven and eight, was made on the basis of low scores on either the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) or the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills. (These were given by the schools the preceding year.) Pupils in the lowest quartile were then given an informal screening test by the reading specialist. The final selection of pupils was made by agreement of the principals, classroom teachers, counselors, and reading specialists. Thirty-one elementary reading specialists (two of whom divided their time equally between reading and mathematics) and five middle school reading specialists were assigned to the program.

TIME INTERVALS: The component operated from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971. The pupils, in grades two through six, left their regular classrooms to work with the reading specialist one hour daily. Working with groups of eight to ten, each elementary specialist taught a maximum of 32 pupils daily. The pupils at one of the two middle schools, in grades seven and eight, were permanently programmed into the reading and language classes. Due to a permanently scheduled activity each Friday afternoon, the pupils worked with the reading and language specialists for 50 minutes four days a week. Working with groups of 12, each middle school specialist taught a maximum of 60 pupils daily. The specialists at the other middle school worked with two or three groups of children in grades seven and eight for 50 minutes daily in remedial reading; there were about 10 pupils in each group. They also worked with two or three groups of children for 50 minutes in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. Each middle school specialist taught a maximum of 50 pupils daily.

ACTIVITIES: Activities were planned specifically to develop verbal and conceptual skills. For pupils in grades two through six this included listening to stories; viewing films; taking walking trips within the community; participating in library clubs, choral reading, storytelling, creative writing, and

play acting; writing newspapers; and making puppets and dioramas to share with other classes. For pupils in grades seven and eight additional activities in reading included control reading, supplemental reading, and reading in skill-oriented groups.

The seventh- and eighth-graders in language participated in a variety of additional writing activities. The pupils in the seventh and eighth grade ESL classes were provided opportunities to hear, imitate, and practice standard English pronunciation and structure. This was accomplished by various activities, such as dramatic presentation, pattern practice, cumulative practice, dialogues, role playing, rhythms, games, physical education, songs, choral work, curriculum walks, poetry, stories, tapes, records, and either pupil-teacher or pupil-pupil conversations. These activities ranged from highly controlled and manipulated, to teacher-guided (conversations), to spontaneous (pupil conversation).

Reading specialists participated in open house activities at the schools, held parent conferences, spoke at faculty and parent club meetings, and served as resource persons to the school staff.

One day of preservice education and 15 inservice education meetings were conducted during the school year to help the participating staff in the attainment of the objective. The inservice program consisted of workshops which stressed teaching methods and techniques in reading, and the construction of teaching aids. Guest speakers discussed reading programs and use of supportive services. Inservice activities included observation visits to public school reading programs.

In addition, the reading specialists met in small groups, by geographic region, for one hour one afternoon each week, under the leadership of the reading consultant and/or teacher-leader to work on mutual problems, materials, and ideas relevant to their area of instruction.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the reading component were

- to improve classroom performance in reading and language beyond usual expectations.
- to raise the median gain of project participants in reading by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.
- to improve the verbal (English) functioning level of the children.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Pre and posttests were used to measure achievement in reading of ESEA pupils and comparison pupils in 30 elementary and two middle schools. Second graders took the Cooperative Primary Test. Third graders took the Stanford Achievement Test while pupils in grades 4 through 8 were tested with the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. Reading, vocabulary, and comprehension scores obtained by the two groups were compared.

The ESL Bilingual Structured Placement Test was given in one middle school to ESL pupils in grades 7-8, and to comparison pupils who spoke little or no English but did not participate in the ESL classes. Pre and posttest scores of the two groups were compared. Questionnaires and rating scales were completed by parents and staff in March.

RESULTS: The objective of achieving one month's growth in reading for each month of instruction (0.1 grade level per school month) was met in grades three and eight, and exceeded in grades two, four, five, six, and seven. In a span of eight months between pre and posttesting, gains ranged from eight months in grades three and eight to eleven months in grades six and seven. The ESEA groups (grades two through six) showed significantly greater gains than the comparison groups. In grades seven and eight the difference between the ESEA and comparison groups were not significant.

In a span of eight months between pre and posttesting, the seventh grade pupils in the language classes showed a gain of seven months for eight months of instruction. The eighth grade pupils for this same period of time gained eight months. These gains were not significantly greater than those of the comparison group.

The seventh and eighth grade ESL pupils, in a span of eight months between pre and posttesting, showed significantly higher gains than their comparison counterparts.

Ratings by administrators, reading specialists, classroom teachers, and parents indicated that the program had improved the academic achievement of pupils.

Teacher participants felt generally that the inservice program was valuable. When asked to rate their expectation and fulfillment of specific inservice content, the rating indicated that their expectations exceeded fulfillment.

CONCLUSIONS: The ESEA groups in reading showed significantly higher gains than the comparison groups in grades two through six. The objective was exceeded in grades two, and four through seven. However, pupils are still below grade level ranging from one year in the second grade to three years in the eighth grade.

The eighth-grade ESEA pupils in language met the objective. The seventh graders lacked just one month in meeting the objective of one month's growth for one month's instruction.

The ESEA groups in ESL (seventh and eighth graders) made significantly higher gains than their comparison groups. The objective of improving the verbal functioning level (English) of children was attained.

Parents and staff endorsed the program and recommended that it continue.

With some reservations, most of the reading specialists regarded the monthly inservice program as successful. The weekly workshops were felt to be helpful but too numerous.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The component should be continued. Communication between the classroom teachers and the reading specialists should be improved. The program at the one middle school should be scheduled so that pupils meet with their teachers five rather than four days a week. A full-time teacher should be budgeted at the two elementary schools where the teachers are now devoting half of their time to reading and half to mathematics.

Processing of requisitions should be improved to speed up the repair and replacement of equipment and arrival of supplies. The workshops should be continued with attention being given to organization and frequency of meetings.

READING

Detailed Report

Attainment of the component objectives was evaluated through scores on the Cooperative Primary Tests (CPT), Reading, Form 12B, pre and post; Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II, Reading, Forms W (pre), and X (post); Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Reading and Language, Form R2, pre and post; and English as a Second Language/Bilingual Structured Placement Test (ESL Test), pre and post. Staff comments and recommendations, and responses by parents to a questionnaire were also analyzed for evaluation. The CPT (Reading) was administered to second-grade ESEA Title I and comparison pupils in September 1970 (pre) and May 1971 (post). The Stanford (Primary II, Reading) was given to Title I and comparison pupils in grade three in September 1970 (pre) and May 1971 (post). In grades four through six, Title I and comparison pupils took the CTBS (Reading) in September 1970 (pre) and May 1971 (post).

In grades seven and eight, the Title I pupils in the reading classes and the comparison pupils took the CTBS (Reading); the Title I pupils in the language classes and their comparison counterparts were given the CTBS (Language); the Title I pupils in the English as a Second Language classes and the comparison pupils were administered the ESL Test. These tests were given in September 1970 (pre) and May 1971 (post).

The comparison groups were composed of pupils who qualified for ESEA reading, language, and ESL instruction, but could not be enrolled in the program because of a shortage of teachers and/or physical facilities.

The CPT included both Reading Vocabulary and Comprehension in one part. The Stanford consisted of two parts: Word Meaning and Paragraph Meaning. The CTBS (Reading) also consisted of two parts: Reading Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension. The CTBS (Language) had three parts: Language Mechanics, Expression, and Spelling. The ESL test consisted of two levels which yielded one total score. Analysis of covariance was used because of the difference in the initial means between groups.

Means for the ESEA and comparison groups are shown in Reading (Table 89), Language (Table 90), and ESL (Table 91). In reading, at every grade level except seven and eight, the comparison groups had higher pre mean scores; all ESEA groups had higher post mean scores.

At grade levels two through six, the ESEA groups attained higher adjusted mean scores which were significant at the .01 level of confidence. There were gains in grades seven and eight; however, they were not significant.

In Language, the pre and post mean scores of the comparison group were higher than those of the ESEA group with the exception of the post score on the Mechanics subtest. The ESEA group attained a higher adjusted mean score on two of the three subtests and on the total test, but these gains were not significant.

In ESL, the ESEA group had higher pre, post, and adjusted mean scores than the comparison group. These scores were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The ESL activity achieved its objective of improving the verbal (English) functioning level of the children.

Grade equivalent gains for ESEA pupils are shown for Reading (Table 92) and Language (Table 93).

In Reading, grades three and eight met the objective; grades two, and four through seven exceeded the objective. In Language, grade eight fell two months short of meeting the objective; grade seven exceeded the objective by the same extent. With the exception of eight-grade language, the objective of a month's gain for a month's instruction was met or exceeded; yet there still remains a decrement from grade equivalency at each grade level.

Table 94 lists the pre and post grade equivalents as well as the gains for grades one through six by school in both administrative zones. Table 95 gives similar information for grades seven and eight.

A program of inservice education was conducted to aid participating staff members in achieving the objective.

Teachers completed a questionnaire on evaluation of the inservice program. They were asked to rate on a 1-5 low-high scale, their "expectations" prior to the opening of each meeting and their "fulfillment" at the close of each meeting.

Expectation and fulfillment ratings on seven items ranged from 3.1 to 3.7 medians. On "quality of leadership," both ratings were at the 3.6 median. On the other six inservice items, no fulfillment rating equalled or exceeded the expectation rating.

In addition to attending general inservice sessions, the reading specialists divided into three groups and met for workshops one hour each week. Of the 28 specialists responding, 12 indicated the meetings were of little value; eight felt they were constructive and helpful. Eight specialists reported that the meetings were held too frequently. Eight respondents failed to indicate whether their comments referred to the reading or to the mathematics workshops.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Of the 400 parents responding (Table 96), 98% stated that their children improved in reading and that they were in favor of having the program continued. Open-end comments by 84 of these parents supported these high ratings.

Comments by 82% of the 111 regular classroom teachers who responded indicated that their pupils had improved in academic achievement. Twenty-five percent of the responding teachers suggested a need for better communication between themselves and the reading specialist.

Open-end comments by the ESEA reading specialists indicated, as they did in the 1969-70 report, that small class size, excellent materials, and freedom to innovate were strengths of the program.

Weaknesses noted by seven of the 24 responding specialists were delayed delivery of supplies, poor repair service, and slow replacement of equipment.

Of the 26 administrators who responded, 25 concurred with parents and teachers that the children had made noticeable academic improvement.

Mathematics Abstract

Pupils	1063
Nonpublic Schools	32
Teachers	31
Aides	0
Approximate Cost	$475,167

DESCRIPTION: The mathematics component in the nonpublic schools provided instruction to small groups of children who required help in that area. Activities were planned to clarify basic math concepts, to improve computational skills, to develop abstract thinking, and to broaden the practical dimension of mathematical knowledge.

The primary mathematics program included grades two and three; the intermediate program, grades four, five, and six; and the middle school program, grades seven and eight. Bases for pupil selection were recommendations of principals, teachers, and counselors, and results of informal tests given by mathematics specialists. Twenty-nine elementary mathematics specialists (two of whom devoted half of their time to reading) and two middle school mathematics specialists were assigned to the program.

TIME INTERVALS: The component operated from mid-September 1970 to mid-June 1971. The pupils, in grades two through six, left their regular classrooms to work with the mathematics specialist one hour daily. Working with groups of eight to ten, each elementary specialist taught a maximum of 32 pupils daily. The pupils, in grades seven and eight also left their regular classrooms and worked with the mathematics specialist for 50 minutes daily; in one of the middle schools, the pupils worked with the mathematics specialist for 50 minutes four days a week, because of a permanently scheduled activity each Friday afternoon. Working with groups of 10 to 12, each middle school specialist taught a maximum of 60 pupils daily.

ACTIVITIES: Textbooks and many concrete and manipulative devices, such as Cuisinaire rods, attribute blocks, geoboards, tangrams, and number balances, were used to help the children crystalize their basic mathematical concepts. Simulated experiences in buying, selling, and banking added dimension to the program. In the seventh and eighth grades, the primary emphasis was on practical and industrial applications.

To assist participants in achievement of the objective, a day of preservice education and 15 inservice education meetings were conducted during the school year. The inservice program consisted of workshops which stressed teaching methods and techniques in mathematics and the construction of teaching aids. Guest speakers discussed significance of the supportive services in the mathematics program. Inservice participants visited and observed mathematics programs in the public schools.

In addition, the mathematics specialists met in small groups, by geographic region, for one hour one afternoon each week, under the leadership of the mathematics consultant and/or teacher-leader; they worked on mutual problems, materials, and ideas relevant to their area of instruction.

OBJECTIVES: The goals of the mathematic's program were
- to improve classroom performance in other skill areas (mathematics) beyond usual expectations.
- to raise the median gain of project participants in mathematics by 1.0 grade level as measured by standardized tests.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Cooperative Primary Tests, Mathematics (Grade 3) and Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Arithmetic (Grades 4 through 8) were given to ESEA pupils in 30 elementary and two middle schools and to a comparison group of non-ESEA pupils of similar initial mathematical ability. Pre and posttest arithmetic scores of the third-grade ESEA pupils and pre and posttest scores in Computation, Concepts, and Application of the fourth- through eighth-grade ESEA pupils were compared with scores of their non-ESEA counterparts in the comparison groups. Questionnaires and rating scales were completed by parents and staff in March.

RESULTS: The objective of achieving one month's growth in mathematics for each month of instruction was not only met, but nearly doubled, in grades four and five. In eight months of instruction, gains in those grades were 15 and 14 months.

Adjusted mean scores of the ESEA groups at grade levels two through eight were (except for the Applications subtest score in grades seven and eight) higher than the adjusted mean scores of the comparison groups. Except in grades seven and eight, the gains made were statistically significant at the .01 level in favor of the ESEA group.

Both the general inservice and the workshops were endorsed by the mathematics specialists, although many felt the workshops met too frequently.

Regular classroom teachers, mathematics specialists, and administrators considered the component to be effective in achieving its objective.

Reporting that their children had improved in mathematics, parents endorsed component activities and favored continuation of the program.

CONCLUSIONS: The objective was exceeded in grades three through six. However, pupils are still below grade level ranging from 6 months in third grade, 14 months in sixth grade to 36 months in the eighth grade.

The ESEA groups showed significantly higher gains than the comparison groups, with the exception of grades seven and eight.

Parent and staff ratings confirmed the effectiveness of the component.

The mathematics specialists endorsed the inservice program. They indicated the

workshop meetings were helpful, though held too frequently and were often poorly organized.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The component should be continued. More meetings should be scheduled between regular school staff and the mathematics specialists to coordinate the program better in each school.

Workshops should be continued; attention should be given to frequency and content of the meetings. A full-time teacher should be budgeted for the two elementary schools where the teachers are now dividing their time between mathematics and reading.

MATHEMATICS

Detailed Report

Attainment of the component objective was evaluated according to scores on the Cooperative Primary Tests (CPT), Mathematics, and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Arithmetic; analysis of staff comments and recommendations as well as responses by parents to a questionnaire were also used in the evaluation.

The CPT (Mathematics, Form 23A) was administered to ESEA Title I pupils and to a comparison group in grade three in September 1970 (pre) and May 1971 (post). In grades four through eight the ESEA Title I and comparison pupils took the CTBS (Arithmetic) in September 1970 (pre) and May 1971 (post). Comparison groups were composed of pupils who qualified for ESEA mathematics instruction but could not be enrolled in the program because of a shortage of teachers and/or physical facilities.

The CPT consisted of Part 1 in which the teacher read the stimulus material, and Part 2 in which the pupil worked with printed stimulus material. Scores on the two parts were combined into one total score. The CTBS consisted of three parts: Arithmetic Computation, Arithmetic Concepts, and Arithmetic Applications.

Means for ESEA and comparison groups are shown in Table 97. The comparison groups had higher pre mean scores in grades three through six, and lower pre mean scores in grades seven and eight. ESEA groups had higher post mean scores at each of the grade levels, three through six. Analysis of covariance revealed that ESEA groups, with the exception of one subtest in grades seven and eight, also had higher adjusted mean scores; these differences in gains were statistically significant of the .01 level of confidence for grades three through six.

Grade equivalent gains for ESEA pupils are shown in Table 98. A measure of success in achievement of the objective of one month's gain for each month of instruction is indicated for grades three through eight. Grades seven and eight failed to meet the objective by three months and one month respectively. Grades three through six exceeded the objective; the highest gain, 15 months' progress for eight months' instruction, was achieved by the fifth grade. Although these gains in grades three through six far exceeded the objective, there still remained a decrement at each grade level.

Table 99 lists the pre and post grade equivalents and gains by grade and school within each administrative area.

A program of inservice education was conducted to aid participants in achievement of the objective. Teachers evaluated the inservice program on a questionnaire which asked them to rate on a 1-5 low-high scale their "expectations" before the beginning of each meeting and their "fulfillment" at the close of each meeting. In the area "quality of leadership," both expectation and fulfillment received the same median rating of 3.6. The ratings for the other areas ranged between the medians 3.1 and 3.7, with no fulfillment exceeding its expectation rating.

In addition to attending general inservice sessions, the mathematics specialists divided into three groups and met for workshops one hour each week. Of the 23 specialists responding, 16 indicated that the workshops were highly motivating and informative, and seven of them said the meetings were too frequent.

Of 344 parents responding to a questionnaire, 96% stated that their children had improved in arithmetic, and 99% were in favor of having the program continued. Their responses are summarized in Table 100.

In open-end comments, 83 of 111 (75%) regular classroom teachers responding to the questionnaire reported that they had observed increased pupil interest and academic achievement.

The 18 mathematics specialists who responded cited as major strengths of the program the small pupil-teacher ratio and individualized instruction (15) and the availability of various kinds of materials, supplies, and equipment (4).

A weakness of the component mentioned by specialists was the need to improve physical facilities (3).

The specialists recommended that inservice meetings be made more meaningful to participants, and that more meetings between lay teachers, nuns, and specialists be scheduled.

Administrators (26 of 32 responding) stated in their open-end comments that the program was successful, and that the specialists evidenced great interest in the children and made every effort to help them.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Abstract

	Adult Participants	Pupils	Approx.Cost
Nonpublic Schools	32		
Staff Development	67 teachers		*
Parent Involvement	3560 parents		*
Intergroup Experiences		1897	*
Counseling	7 counselors	500	$118,741
Health	6 nurses	1897	$106,113
PSA		250	None

*Included under Language Arts and Mathematics

DESCRIPTION: The instructional program in the nonpublic schools was strengthened by such auxiliary services as counseling, health, and pupil services and attendance (PSA); these, plus the activities of staff development, parent involvement, and intergroup relations, constituted the supportive services element of the NPS component in 1970-71.

The programs in participating schools, grades one through eight, involved regular staff members and specially funded personnel; the programs were designed to improve academic achievement of Title I pupils in these schools.

TIME INTERVALS: Activities were conducted from mid-September 1970, through the end of the school year in June 1971, and into the summer session, June 28-August 6, 1971.

ACTIVITIES: In general, all supportive service activities in NPS were similar to those in the public schools. (See descriptions in the Auxiliary Services section.)

Auxiliary Services: Counseling services available to the public schools were available also to the nonpublic schools upon request. Seven counselors were assigned to the NPS component. Six nurses worked full time with NPS pupils enrolled in the specially funded reading and mathematics classes. Dental care and limited medical service could be obtained by NPS pupils; however, the position of physician was unfilled. PSA counselors also were available on request to consult with agencies or Title I pupils on school behavior or home problems.

Intergroup Relations: Each class taught by a math or reading specialist was paired with a class located outside the target area. The partner groups made five field trips together as a basis for promoting intergroup communication and providing academic and cultural enrichment. All Title I pupils in the target schools took part in the program. Parents were invited to assist in the planning and to accompany pupils on the field trips.

Parent Involvement: Advisory committees of parents met regularly, and a number of Title I parents were members of parent-teacher groups. Agendas of advisory committee and parent-teacher group meetings often included demonstrations of teaching techniques, workshop sessions, and presentations by outside speakers.

Parent volunteers accompanied NPS pupils on field trips and assisted teachers in the classroom. The Title I teachers reported an average of 16 parents visiting the classroom and observing instruction during the year, and an average of 23 conferences with parents of Title I pupils.

The schools also encouraged after-school father-son, mother-daughter, and family activities, which involved an undetermined number of Title I parents.

Staff Development: Included in the staff development programs for ESEA personnel in the NPS program were preschool workshops and inservice education meetings on nonpublic school holidays; also weekly workshops in mathematics and reading instruction were arranged by geographic areas. (Workshops are described more completely in the instructional section of this NPS report.)

During some inservice sessions, teaching materials were constructed; other programs dealt with teaching methods and techniques, an understanding of the culture of poverty, and administrative problems connected with the program. Personnel from curriculum, health, and guidance and counseling spoke on problems in their respective areas.

Regular faculty of the nonpublic schools was invited to attend staff development programs for the Title I teacher and certain other sessions. The objective here was to establish a continuity of programs, an understanding, and a team relationship for the benefit of the pupils.

OBJECTIVES: The specific goals of the supportive services component were
- to raise the academic achievement level of ESEA Title I participants.
- to identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process.
- to identify health defects of children.
- to assist parents in obtaining appropriate health referral.
- to correct dental defects in pupils.
- to increase parent awareness of the responsibility to see that their children attend school.
- to improve attendance in school.
- to improve communications among school, home, and community resources.
- to assist parents in understanding the educational program of the school.
- to provide inservice education.
- to change in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multicultural experience.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: Academic achievement of Title I participants was measured by the administration of standardized tests as reported in the evaluation of the instructional component.

A frequency count of services and participants was made for each auxiliary service, and ratings and comments by staff personnel were analyzed. A questionnaire was completed by Title I teachers to obtain a description and evaluation

of activities in parental involvement and staff development in their schools. Both a teacher questionnaire and a pupil rating scale were used to evaluate the intergroup experience program.

Auxiliary Services - Counseling: Counseling service was proved indispensable to the success of the pupils participating in the instructional program.

Results: Counseling and psychological services were provided for Title I children in 32 nonpublic schools. Services included individual diagnostic studies with suggestions for prescriptive teaching and behavioral modification; individual and group counseling; parent conferences; and consultant help to school staff.

Teachers rated the counseling services effective in helping children with learning, behavioral, and self-concept problems. Teachers' comments about counseling services were predominantly good (22 positive, 5 negative). The counselors' most important contribution to the program, as reported by 19 teachers and 3 counselors, was individual diagnosis with suggestions for teaching. "Too few counselors" or "too little counseling time" was the most frequently repeated criticism of the component.

Conclusions: The counseling component in the nonpublic schools met its objective: "to identify specific assets and limitations relating to the learning process." Teacher-counselor teamwork was a prominent strength of the component.

Recommendations: Counseling service should be continued. The possibility of obtaining more counselors should be investigated. Performance objectives for counseling services should be developed.

- Health: A strong instructional program alone is usually insufficient to help a pupil compensate for the conditions which caused him to be identified as an educationally disadvantaged pupil in the first place. Physical defects or poor health constitute a major portion of such causes.

Results: Almost all of the 1900 project pupils received multiple health services, including dental examinations provided by a minigrant. The number of detections of health defects was down by one-fourth, and the percent of defects corrected was down from 34 to 29. Major defects were dental, ear-nose-throat, and visual. Staff ratings and comments were supportive, but most respondents felt that the program should not be limited to pupils enrolled in funded instructional programs.

Conclusions: The component attained its objectives in identifying and correcting defects which constituted a handicap to learning. Although a greater variety of services was rendered, there was a decrease in the volume of some services. Defect correction percentages are regressing to early ESEA levels.

Recommendations: The component as it is presently constituted should be continued. Services should be extended to nonproject students in the participating schools as far as available resources will permit. Efforts should be concentrated on the correction of health defects.

- Pupil Services and Attendance: No amount of funding, prescriptive teaching, supplementary materials, counseling, medical and other services can raise the achievement level of the educationally disadvantaged child if he did not attend school regularly.

Results: Pupil Services and Attendance counselors served more than 200 pupils in nonpublic schools at the request of those schools. The counselors worked with pupils, their families, and agencies.

Conclusions: In the absence of (a) objectives outlining a level or quantity of desired performance, (b) an established baseline precedent, and (c) written evidence of participants and services, it is impossible to form a conclusion as to what extent the component attained the general objectives of improving attendance and increasing parental responsibility.

Recommendations: Objectives should be stated in terms of performance. In order to establish a base for accountability and evaluation, it is recommended that counselors be assigned specifically to nonpublic schools and that they keep records of their services.

Intergroup Relations: Instructional activities within the schools as well as field trips and other enriching experiences were planned to alleviate racial, social, and linguistic isolation. They were designed to foster interaction between and among groups of children from different racial, cultural, and socio-economic groups.

Results: About 1900 nonpublic school pupils in Title I programs, grades two through six, participated in intergroup relations activities with a similar number of children from nonpublic schools outside the target area.

Teachers rated the program positively both in improving the self-image of pupils and in assisting pupils to broaden and enrich their own backgrounds. Pre and post pupil ratings, administered in grades four through six, showed a drop in posttest median scores in areas pertaining to other ethnic and socio-economic groups. These results were reinforced by independent teacher ratings of pupil attitude toward people of different ethnic origin.

Conclusions: The first phase of implementing an intergroup relations component was accomplished. The component, as evidenced by teacher responses, provided cultural and academic enrichment, and improved pupil self-concept.

The attitude rating scale revealed that pupils did not change their ratings on items referring to themselves, but lowered slightly their ratings on items referring to others on the posttest.

This pattern duplicates that found during past years of testing in the public schools where the use of a pupil attitude scale tended to result in decreased ratings of other ethnic groups on the posttest. A scale that measures changing attitudes of elementary pupils is at best an imperfect instrument. The many variables which can affect attitudes are difficult to control or measure. Internal measurements of test validity and reliability generally have been unsatisfactory; measures of pupil attitudinal change may be considered only as an indication of a broad trend and must be interpreted with extreme caution.

Recommendations: The program should be continued. Partner schools should be selected that are ethnically different, yet geographically close to curtail travel time. Teachers who are committed to the program should be chosen and should receive preservice and inservice training with their partners. Communication between partner teachers is especially important.

Parents should be involved as fully as possible. Research should be continued to locate or develop a self-concept scale for use with pupils. Written and taped responses to their ethnically integrated experiences should be obtained.

Parent Involvement: A systematic plan for parent involvement was developed to make parents aware of the school's instructional program and their child's progress in the school. Parent participation was designed to assist parents in helping their children in the learning process.

Results: Parents and members of Parent Advisory Groups were strongly supportive of their schools and enthusiastic about Title I programs. Teachers (47 responses, a 70% return) reported classroom visitation by parents, parent conferences, assistance from parent volunteers, attendance at Parent Advisory Group meetings, and a variety of other parent involvement activities. They considered programs in their schools to be effective in improving communications among school, home, and community, and in increasing parent understanding.

Conclusions: Parent interest in the schools and in the progress of their children is evident. Their involvement and interest should benefit both school and community.

Recommendations: Efforts to involve parents and improve parent-school-community communications should continue. If raising academic achievement levels of ESEA Title I participants is to be retained as a parent-involvement objective in 1971-72, effort should be made to rank schools by the extent and depth of involvement; progress of pupils in schools with the greatest and least parent involvement could then be compared.

Staff Development: Programs were planned to strengthen teacher competence in instructional areas and to foster positive attitudinal changes among all staff members, particularly toward those children in the school considered to be educationally disadvantaged.

Results: Teacher reports show participation in NPS inservice, including general faculty meetings, smaller meetings by grade level or subject area, classroom visitation and observation in another school, and observation within their own school.

The NPS teachers rated inservice most helpful in assisting them to develop curricular innovations; it aided also in improving teaching skills in specific areas. (In each of these areas, they assigned a 3.6 median rating to helpfulness of inservice on a 1-5, Very Little-Very Much scale.) Helpfulness in improving skills and use of paraprofessionals (2.6) and improving skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs (2.8) were the areas in which NPS teachers assigned their lowest median ratings; incidentally, these were the only areas in which their medians were lower than those assigned by public school teachers on a similar questionnaire.

Conclusions: In general, NPS teachers recognized the value of inservice/staff development programs, and seemed more satisfied with these programs than their co-workers in the public schools.

Recommendations: More inservice attention might profitably be directed toward techniques of working with aides and other paraprofessionals, improving skills of such paraprofessionals, and improving teacher skill in diagnosing learning needs of individual students.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Detailed Report

Teachers in 32 nonpublic schools received a questionnaire designed to evaluate the supportive services component; 47 responses represented a 70% return from the 67 teachers. Questionnaires also went to Parent Advisory Group members; 153 of 428 parents and school members responded, a 36% return. Other questionnaires were distributed to teachers and pupils in regard to intergroup activities. Reactions of participants in inservice sessions also were obtained; they are summarized in the appropriate instructional component section of this report.

From the quantity and quality of responses received, it may be assumed that the component met its objective of raising the academic achievement level of the ESEA Title I participants.

It is reasonable to believe that the pupils' academic achievement would be improved through the benefits offered by the auxiliary services, through the involvement of parents in the school program, by experience in intergroup activities, and through the increased competence of staff members. However, these assumed effects can neither be measured directly nor attributed with any certainty to one supportive service activity rather than to another.

Standardized tests were used to measure levels of academic achievement reached by participants in the instructional components.

Supportive services include the auxiliary services, intergroup relations, parent involvement, and staff development.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS: The Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE) in nonpublic schools (NPS) was evaluated according to the following indicators: scores on a locally devised pupil attitude scale, teacher ratings of program effectiveness, and analysis of pupil, teacher, and administrator comments. Pupils completed rating scales in December and May, teachers responded to questionnaires in January and May, and administrators completed questionnaires at the end of the school year. Rating scores and responses indicated that the objective of changing in a positive direction attitudes toward other ethnic groups through multi-cultural experience, was met.

The pupil attitude scale was completed by pupils of seven schools randomly selected from the 30 nonpublic elementary schools in the Title I program. The children in the sample were limited to 4th, 5th and 6th grade pupils. The scale consisted of 16 paired items; on eight items pupils rated their own class, and on the other eight they rated the class from the partner school. Median posttest ratings on items referring to their own class showed little change; median posttest ratings of the partner class were lower on all eight items (Table 101).

Teachers rated the program above average for enriching pupil backgrounds, increasing knowledge of subject matter, and improving pupil self-image. They rated it average for making themselves aware of other groups and developing positive self-attitudes. Teachers rated the component low-average for developing positive attitudes of their pupils toward other ethnic groups (Table 102).

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Fourteen of 18 principals who responded felt the program had been successful in improving intergroup relations. Written comments by 30 teachers supported this opinion. The cultural and academic enrichment provided by the program was a strength cited by both principals and teachers.

Teachers felt that informal intergroup activities (19) were the most effective means of improving intercultural attitudes. Playing games together (17), eating lunch (11), field trips (11), and going on picnics and sports day events (7), were other activities most frequently suggested.

Scheduling and bussing problems (32) were viewed as shortcomings of the program. Teachers mentioned lack of communication with partner-school teachers and parents (13) and poor understanding of goals and objectives (5) as other weaknesses. Three principals felt that the trips were disruptive of regular class work.

In addition to PIE, the Title I special math and reading teachers (NPS) indicated intergroup activities in the following areas: sister school program (21 mentions), speakers or programs promoting intercultural exchange (20), provision of ethnic study centers in the classroom or library (14), school newspaper exchange (7), and other exchanges of pupils or teachers (6).

Some of the comments teachers made on intergroup activities were:

> I have personally purchased classic books that deal with lives of famous Negroes.
>
> Slides on Africa and Job Corps Volunteers were presented.
>
> Books and teacher-made tapes of them that refer to Mexican American children and their culture were used as often as they could be found.
>
> Grade 4 pupils visited St. Bruno Catholic School to see a special program presented by Compton Avenue Public School. There was very much to see and do and much learning took place.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT: The parent involvement component in nonpublic schools was evaluated by responses on parent and teacher questionnaires. The program met its objectives of improving communications among school, home, and community resources, and of assisting parents in understanding the educational program of the school.

Parent reactions to academic programs are reported in the Reading and Mathematics sections of this report.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Parent Advisory Group questionnaires (153 returns) showed the number of members who had attended meetings as reported below:

Number of Meetings Attended	Number of Members Reporting Attendance
Only 1	5
2-4	63
5-7	36
8-10	15
More than 10	8

The respondents reported informal contacts on Advisory Group business that were made with the principal and Title I teachers; these figures refer to phone calls or conversations outside regular meetings.

Number of Contacts	Number of Members Reporting Contacts
Only 1	10
2-4	44
5-7	39
8-10	14
More than 10	14

Asked if they were gaining new facts or ideas about the school, 132 respondents answered affirmatively, 8 negatively. The advisory group members indicated, 133 to 5, that all members had an opportunity to present their views in discussions; and, 130 to 4, they said that group members worked well together.

They responded that the group, chairman, principal, and teachers determined the number of meetings to be held and the topics or subjects to be covered. Their feelings concerning meetings and activities were a strong endorsement of them (Table 103).

Topics they considered important (91 separate responses) included: academic programs in reading and mathematics (40 mentions); Title I guidelines, programs, and effectiveness (29); field trips, including PIE excursions and attendance at cultural programs (26); auxiliary and supportive programs, including counseling and health (17); parent-teacher communication and cooperation (12); budget and school financial problems (10); and increasing parent interest and involvement (9).

Studying the academic programs, assisting with field trips, developing increased understanding and cooperation, and increasing parent involvement were among projects or activities considered most successful.

Forty-seven NPS teachers responded to the parent involvement section of the teacher questionnaire. Of these, 31 reported that they had attended target school Parent Advisory Group meetings. Their attendance at PTA meetings, or meetings of a similar group in the school, can be summarized as follows:

Number of Meetings Attended	Number of Teachers Reporting Such Attendance
1	6
2	9
3	8
4	9
5	5
6	3
8	4
15	1

Forty teachers reported assistance in class or extra-curricular activities by 1 to 35 parent volunteers during the year; a tally of reports indicated a total of 350 parents had volunteered. Visits from 601 parents were reported by 37 teachers; this is an average of 16 visitors for the teachers who reported. Parent conferences were held with 1,014 parents by 44 teachers.

Twenty-nine teachers listed parent participation in school programs including Open House (17 mentions); parents' meetings (10); school carnival, fair, or fiesta (8); Christmas party (4); and field trips (3).

Asked to compare the amount of involvement/participation by Title I parents in 1970-71 with involvement in the preceding year, 36 teachers responded. Six indicated parental activity had declined, 9 that it was remaining steady, and 21 (58.3%) that it had increased.

The teachers were asked also to rate effectiveness of the school's Title I program in improving communications and assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school. Their ratings, shown below, were not greatly different from those assigned by public school teachers to their schools' efforts in the same two areas. The public school medians were 3.4 and 3.5.

Ratings by NPS Teachers

Effectiveness of the Title I program in:	N	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
		Very Ineffective				Very Effective	
		1	2	3	4	5	
Improving communications among school, home, and community resources.	44	3	1	13	24	3	3.7
Assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school.	44	2	4	12	21	5	3.6

In conclusion, reactions of Parent Advisory Group members, parents, and teachers, as well as the number of parents involved, indicate that the component is meeting its objectives of improving communications among school, home, and community

resources, and assisting parents to understand the educational program of the school. Parent comments are strongly supportive of the schools and NPS programs, and many parents are involved in various school activities.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT: Responses to teacher questionnaires were the basis of evaluation to determine how well the component achieved its objective of providing inservice education. Teacher reactions to specific inservice programs in reading or mathematics are reported in the appropriate instructional section of this evaluation report.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Responding to a general questionnaire on inservice, 47 teachers indicated the number of staff development meetings, activities, or events attended in several categories or areas. The responses indicated that 42 had made classroom visitations and observed instruction in another school (more than 167 such visits were mentioned), 40 had participated in more than 200 general faculty meetings, and 38 had taken part in NPS staff inservice (attending more than 650 meetings). Small meetings by grade level, special field of interest, or similar division were reported by 35 respondents; and 27 reported observations at their own school.

Asked to rate the values of inservice/staff development in improving various aspects of their work, the teachers indicated that the greatest help was in improving teaching skills in specific areas and in developing curricular innovations. Their ratings are shown in Table 104.

Only two of the teachers added comments on inservice, both negative. They criticized the waste of time in meetings on "busy work" and "nonessential details."

NPS teachers assigned higher ratings to inservice activity than did public school teachers on a similar questionnaire with two exceptions. In improving skills and use of paraprofessionals (no aides are assigned in the nonpublic schools), and in improving skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs, public school teacher ratings were higher than those of NPS teachers.

Success of inservice/staff development programs is difficult to measure, but it is clear that much staff development work is being done in the NPS component, and that most teachers recognize the need for and importance of such work.

HEALTH SERVICES: The services rendered to elementary pupils in nonpublic schools by the health services team reflects multiple services and a duplicated pupil count. The number of pupil defects reported dropped from 3800 in 1969-70 to 2800 in 1970-71; and percent of defects corrected dropped from 34 to 29 during the same period. Compared to previous years, this represents a regression to early ESEA service levels (1966-67, 27%; 1967-68, 36%; 1968-69, 43%). Major defects reported were dental, visual, orthopedic, and ear-nose-throat.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Forty-seven teachers completed a rating form and questionnaire on health services. They gave a high rating to the identification of health defects and to assistance in obtaining appropriate health referral, and an average rating to correction of dental defects. The dental minigrant was implemented late in the school term.

Thirty teachers wrote comments, positive in varying degrees. Most teachers expressed the need for more services, in general, and physicians' services, in particular.

Twenty-five of 32 administrators also commented on the services. Their responses were substantially the same as the teachers.

AUXILIARY SERVICES: The goal of Auxiliary Services is to identify and treat problems of pupils through the services of guidance and attendance counselors, and health personnel. The Auxiliary Services of which the non-public schools availed themselves were counseling and health. No funds were allocated for Pupil Services and Attendance counselors. PSA counselors, however, were available on request to consult with Title I pupils on behavior problems.

COUNSELING: This component was evaluated by analysis of counselors' records of services they provided, and by ratings and comments of teachers, counselors, and administrators. To what extent the objective of identifying specific assets and limitations of the learning process was met, may be concluded from the following description and data.

Academic retardation and need for further data were the two main reasons for referral of 125 Title I children in the nonpublic schools. Seventy-nine of those referred for study were boys with the distribution of pupils fairly even among grades 2-5. The Stanford-Binet and the WISC were the only individual tests of ability utilized; the Wide Range Achievement Test and The Gilmore Oral Reading Test were usually the individual achievement tests used. Semi-projective evaluations of emotional and physiological maturity were obtained from the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt, Draw a Person and Draw a Family tests. Most frequent of counselor recommendations for assistance to pupils was to the reading specialists. Next most frequent was for remedial help in the regular classroom.

NPS counselor reports show that 358 pupils were counseled individually for one to three sessions each, and 61 pupils were counseled individually for four or more sessions. Group counseling sessions provided for 194 children and six teachers.

Title I math and reading teachers rated the effectiveness of the counseling and psychological services for helping them work with pupils to solve learning problems, to cope with behavior problems, and to develop positive pupil self-concepts (Table 105). Ratings were slightly above average on all three items.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: Thirty teachers wrote multiple open-end comments about the counseling and psychological services. Of these, 22 were judged positive and 5 negative. Nineteen comments mentioned favorably the counselor's assistance in diagnosing pupil weaknesses and problems. Eight teachers called for more services, and five desired earlier diagnostic screening. Negative criticisms were directed to the lack of counselor services, including follow-up, and to counselor procedures.

Sixteen of 23 administrators responding indicated that the counseling services had been beneficial. Diagnosing pupil problems with recommendations for teacher remediation, individual and group counseling, and consultant help to teachers were mentioned. Three administrators felt that there was too little feedback from their counselors.

Sample comments of teachers were:

> Our counselor has done an excellent job in helping me pinpoint areas of weakness in students. With his cooperation and suggestions I've been able to find ways to meet the needs of my students.
>
> Counselor assisted with every problem I asked about:
> a. Behavior modification program
> b. Testing for M.R.
> c. Helping to screen class
> d. Testing during year and reexamining for rest of year
> e. Counseling with parents
>
> Need for better formulated referral services for students in need of psychological help. Inadequate follow-up on students because counselors have too many schools.

Here are some representative comments of administrators:

> The counselor has given great service to the school in discovering possible psychological and other reasons for lack of achievement on the part of several children in the program. The classroom teachers, as well as the special teachers and principals, have been given new insights regarding specific children, procedures, and criteria for general observation.
>
> Excellent program. It is really very sad that the counselor cannot take care of other children with problems, but only those in the program. We have many other children who would benefit from counseling.
>
> Our counseling program seems to be mainly testing. It is difficult to evaluate unless I know how the teachers follow through on test results.

Table 89 — Analysis of Covariance of ESEA and Comparison Groups (Reading)

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Cooperative Primary Test, Reading Vocabulary and Comprehension, Form 12B				
ESEA Groups, Grade 2	199	12.94	29.95	30.21
Comparison Groups, Grade 2	61	18.11	27.23	26.38
			F(1,257) =	11.35**
Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II[a] Word Meaning				
ESEA Groups, Grade 3	234	10.00	17.07	17.37
Comparison Groups, Grade 3	77	12.82	15.99	15.08
			F(1,308) =	11.35**
Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II[a] Paragraph Meaning				
ESEA Groups, Grade 3	234	12.50	26.12	26.64
Comparison Groups, Grade 3	77	16.69	23.60	21.99
			F(1,308) =	18.81**
Stanford Achievement Test Primary II[a] Total Scores				
ESEA Groups, Grade 3	234	22.50	43.10	44.05
Comparison Groups, Grade 3	77	29.12	39.58	36.70
			F(1,308) =	23.76**
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Reading Vocabulary, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	516	11.38	17.62	17.98
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	186	13.23	16.83	15.84
			F(1,699) =	17.12**
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Reading Comprehension, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	518	13.56	19.97	20.22
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	188	15.02	19.14	18.44
			F(1,703) =	11.30**
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Total Scores, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	515	24.97	37.66	38.38
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	186	28.34	36.06	34.05
			F(1,698) =	24.78**

Note.—[a]Form W, Pre; Form X, Post. **Significant at .01 level.

Table 89 — Continued

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Reading Vocabulary, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	157	21.62	25.92	25.87
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	44	21.34	24.75	24.93
			F(1,198) = 1.58	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Reading Comprehension, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	155	22.23	27.57	27.44
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	44	21.11	26.07	26.54
			F(1,196) = 0.93	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Total Scores, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	155	43.92	53.59	53.34
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	44	42.45	50.82	51.68
			F(1,196) = 1.44	

Table 90 — Analysis of Covariance of ESEA and Comparison Groups (Language)

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Language Mechanics, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	52	14.27	18.50	18.61
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	28	14.89	18.21	18.01
				F(1,77) = 0.52
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Language Expression, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	52	16.90	18.77	18.85
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	28	17.29	20.25	20.10
				F(1,77) = 2.51
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Language Spelling, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	52	17.35	20.04	21.03
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	28	21.00	22.11	20.27
				F(1,77) = 0.77
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Total Scores, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	52	48.52	57.31	58.51
Comparison Groups, Grades 7 and 8	28	53.18	60.57	58.34
				F(1,77) = 0.01

Table 91 — Analysis of Covariance of ESEA and Comparison Groups (ESL)

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Bilingual Structured Placement Test, Levels I and II				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7 and 8	17	19.18	77.59	75.38
Comparison Groups, Grades 6, 7, 8	11	3.55	12.73	16.15
				F(1,25) = 65.05**

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 92 — ESEA Reading Test Results by Grades

GRADE	N	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE	POST	DIFF.
2	199	1.1	2.0	0.9
3	234	1.8	2.6	0.8
4	226	2.9	3.9	1.0
5	184	3.5	4.5	1.0
6	105	3.9	5.0	1.1
7	83	4.7	5.8	1.1
8	72	5.0	5.8	0.8

Note.—Table 92 is based on median raw scores.
Time interval between pre (September 1970) and post (May 1971) was 8 months.

Table 93 — ESEA Language Test Results by Grades

GRADE	N	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE	POST	DIFF.
7	32	4.2	5.4	1.2
8	20	5.5	6.1	0.6

Note.—Table 93 is based on median raw scores.
Time interval between pre (September 1970) and post (May 1971) was 8 months.

Table 94 — Reading Test Results by Schools - Grades 2-6

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
A	Ascension	3	8	1.8	8	2.8	1.0
		4	12	3.0	12	4.5	1.5
		5	11	3.2	11	4.8	1.6
		6					
A	Mother of Sorrows	2	16	1.2	16	2.7	1.5
		3	3	1.9	3	2.5	0.6
		4	3	2.2	3	4.0	1.8
		5	2	2.0	2	5.2	3.2
		6					
A	St. Aloysius	3	7	1.7	7	2.7	1.0
		4	7	2.8	7	4.3	1.5
		5	6	3.4	6	5.8	2.4
		6	6	3.8	6	6.6	2.8
A	St. Lawrence Brindisi	3	15	1.8	15	2.1	0.3
		4	7	2.6	7	4.0	1.4
		5	5	3.2	5	3.3	0.1
		6					
A	St. Malachy	2	8	1.5	8	2.2	0.7
		3	8	1.5	8	2.3	0.8
		4	8	2.9	8	4.1	1.2
		5	6	3.1	6	3.0	-0.1
		6					
A	St. Michael	2	6	1.8	6	2.4	0.6
		3	7	2.3	7	2.7	0.4
		4	4	2.1	4	3.1	0.9
		5	8	3.9	8	4.9	1.0
		6					
A	San Miguel	2	10	1.3	10	1.9	0.6
		3	9	1.7	9	2.3	0.6
		4	7	2.4	7	3.6	1.2
		5	3	3.4	3	4.3	0.9
		6	4	1.8	4	4.2	2.4
B	Assumption	3	6	1.6	6	2.5	0.9
		4	5	3.5	5	3.8	0.3
		5	4	3.5	4	3.9	0.4
		6	8	3.2	8	4.1	0.9
B	Dolores Mission	2	5	1.0	5	1.8	0.8
		3	4	1.5	4	2.2	0.7
		4	6	2.1	6	3.0	0.9
		5	3	2.2	3	3.7	1.5
		6	7	2.2	7	3.5	1.3

Table 94 — Continued

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
B	Immaculate Conception	3	8	1.8	8	2.5	0.7
		4	7	2.9	7	4.0	1.1
		5	8	4.0	8	5.6	1.6
		6	9	4.8	9	5.3	0.5
B	Nativity	2	8	1.8	8	2.4	0.6
		3	7	2.7	7	3.0	0.3
		4	8	3.0	8	3.4	0.4
		5	7	4.7	7	5.3	0.6
		6	1	4.7	1	5.1	0.4
B	Our Lady Guadalupe	2	11	1.1	11	2.1	1.0
		3	12	1.8	12	2.8	1.0
		4	8	3.0	8	4.3	1.3
		5					
		6					
B	Our Lady Help of Christians	2	16	1.0	16	2.0	1.0
		3	8	2.0	8	3.0	1.0
		4					
		5	7	3.8	7	4.6	0.8
		6	1	3.0	1	3.1	0.1
B	Our Lady of Loretto	2	8	1.0	8	2.1	1.1
		3	8	1.7	8	2.6	0.9
		4	9	2.5	9	4.1	1.6
		5	9	2.6	9	4.2	1.6
		6					
B	Our Lady of Lourdes	2	3	1.7	3	2.3	0.6
		3	18	1.8	18	2.5	0.7
		4	14	3.0	14	3.8	0.8
		5	18	3.6	18	4.2	0.6
		6	7	3.8	7	5.4	1.6
B	Our Lady of Soledad	2	5	1.0	5	2.2	1.2
		3	3	1.8	3	2.4	0.6
		4	8	3.1	8	4.2	1.1
		5	12	3.9	12	5.4	1.5
		6	4	3.4	4	4.3	0.9
B	Our Lady of Talpa	2	8	1.0	8	1.8	0.8
		3	9	1.6	9	2.2	0.6
		4					
		5					
		6					

Table 94 — Continued

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
B	Resurrection	3	8	1.8	8	2.1	0.3
		4	8	2.5	8	3.6	1.1
		5	6	3.9	6	4.3	0.4
		6	8	4.1	8	4.7	0.6
B	Sacred Heart	2	15	1.0	15	1.8	0.8
		3					
		4	8	3.4	8	3.9	0.5
		5	6	3.6	6	4.0	0.4
		6	3	3.4	3	4.1	0.7
B	St. Agnes	3	9	1.9	9	2.5	0.6
		4	6	3.1	6	4.7	1.6
		5	7	3.4	7	4.1	0.7
		6	7	3.9	7	5.2	1.3
B	St. Columbkille	2	7	1.4	7	1.8	0.4
		3	6	1.9	6	2.3	0.4
		4	7	2.8	7	3.4	0.6
		5	7	4.2	7	4.7	0.5
		6	2	4.9	2	4.3	-0.6
B	St. Mary	2	9	1.2	9	2.6	1.4
		3	8	1.6	8	2.7	1.1
		4	7	3.1	7	3.9	0.8
		5	8	3.2	8	4.3	1.1
		6					
B	St. Odilia	2	9	1.0	9	3.0	2.0
		3	9	1.8	9	3.0	1.2
		4	7	2.2	7	4.5	2.3
		5	6	2.7	6	5.1	2.4
		6					
B	St. Raphael	2	8	1.7	8	1.8	0.1
		3	8	2.4	8	2.9	0.5
		4	3	3.2	3	5.7	2.5
		5	4	3.7	4	5.7	2.0
		6	1	3.9	1	5.7	1.8
B	St. Thomas	2	7	1.1	7	2.0	0.9
		3	8	1.7	8	2.2	0.5
		4	4	2.7	4	4.2	1.5
		5	6	4.1	6	4.9	0.8
		6	6	4.6	6	5.8	1.2

Table 94 — Continued

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
B	St. Turibius	2	15	1.5	15	1.8	0.3
		3	14	1.8	14	2.6	0.8
		4	17	3.0	17	3.5	0.5
		5	8	3.1	8	3.7	0.6
		6	5	4.0	5	4.8	0.8
B	St. Vincent	3	8	1.8	8	2.6	0.8
		4	8	2.3	8	2.6	0.3
		5	5	4.1	5	5.0	0.9
		6	7	4.5	7	5.2	0.7
B	San Antonio Padua	3	9	1.7	9	2.5	0.8
		4	10	3.1	10	3.5	0.4
		5	8	3.7	8	4.3	0.6
		6	9	4.0	9	5.4	1.4
B	Santa Isabel	2	15	1.3	15	2.2	0.9
		3					
		4	18	3.2	18	4.3	1.1
		5					
		6					
B	Santa Teresita	2	10	1.0	10	2.2	1.2
		3	7	2.0	7	3.4	1.4
		4	7	2.9	7	3.8	0.9
		5	3	3.1	3	4.1	1.0
		6					

Table 95 — Reading and Language Test Results - Grades 7-8

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	PRE N_1	PRE G.E.	POST N_2	POST G.E.	GAIN
Reading							
B	Holy Cross	7	66	4.8	66	5.7	0.9
		8	47	5.3	47	5.9	0.6
B	Our Lady Queen of Angels	7	17	4.5	17	6.0	1.5
		8	23	4.5	23	5.8	1.3
Language							
B	Holy Cross	7	32	4.2	32	5.4	1.2
		8	20	5.5	20	6.1	0.6

Table 96 — Parent Responses

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Do you feel your child improved in reading?	98	2	396
Does your child do more reading at home?	79	21	392
Has your child's attitude toward school improved?	94	6	393
Did you receive information about the program?	90	10	394
Would you like to have this program continued?	98	2	392
Did you visit the program?	58	42	395

Note.—Table 96 is based on Form 021P. N = 400

Table 97 — Analysis of Covariance of ESEA and Comparison Groups

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Cooperative Primary Tests Mathematics, Form 23A				
ESEA Groups, Grade 3		23.91	36.22	36.77
Comparison Groups, Grade 3		27.26	32.04	30.89
			F(1,308) = 53.58**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Computation, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	591	20.02	30.69	31.01
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	223	21.82	27.96	27.09
			F(1,811) = 63.00**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Concepts, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	591	10.51	16.48	16.57
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	223	11.06	14.48	14.24
			F(1,811) = 45.97**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Applications, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	591	5.64	8.87	8.90
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	223	5.85	8.08	8.00
			F(1,811) = 11.77**	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Total Score, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	590	36.14	56.01	56.55
Comparison Groups, Grades 4, 5, 6	222	38.75	50.49	49.05
			F(1,809) = 77.71**	

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 97 — Continued

TEST AND GROUP	N	PRE MEAN	POST MEAN	ADJUSTED MEAN
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Computation, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7, 8	101	33.11	37.58	37.40
Comparison Groups, Grades 7, 8	27	31.44	35.85	36.54
			F(1,125) = 0.58	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Concepts, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7, 8	101	17.22	19.70	19.45
Comparison Groups, Grades 7, 8	27	15.15	17.30	18.25
			F(1,125) = 1.87	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Applications, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7, 8	100	9.92	11.42	11.13
Comparison Groups, Grades 7, 8	27	7.70	10.30	11.38
			F(1,124) = 0.14	
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills Arithmetic Total Score, Form R2				
ESEA Groups, Grades 7, 8	100	60.30	68.75	67.90
Comparison Groups, Grades 7,8	27	54.30	63.44	66.59
			F(1,124) = 0.42	

Table 98 — ESEA Mathematics Test Results by Grades

GRADE	N	GRADE EQUIVALENT PRE	POST	DIFF.
3	211	2.0	3.3	1.3
4	205	2.6	4.1	1.5
5	232	3.5	4.9	1.4
6	153	4.4	5.5	1.1
7	53	5.3	5.8	0.5
8	47	5.2	5.9	0.7

Note.—Time interval between pre (September 1970) and (May 1971) was 8 months.
Grade equivalent is based on median raw score.

Table 99 — Mathematics Test Results by Schools - Grades 2-6

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	N	PRE G.E.	POST G.E.	GAIN
A	Ascension	3	15	1.9	2.9	1.0
		4	8	2.2	4.2	2.0
		5	8	3.4	4.1	0.7
		6				
A	Mother of Sorrows	3	10	2.2	2.7	0.5
		4	8	2.8	3.8	1.0
		5	8	3.8	5.2	1.4
		6	6	4.1	5.2	1.1
A	St. Aloysius	3	8	1.8	2.9	1.1
		4	6	2.3	4.0	1.7
		5	9	4.4	4.9	0.5
		6	7	4.6	5.0	0.4
A	St. Lawrence Brindisi	3	15	2.1	3.0	0.9
		4	6	2.9	4.0	1.1
		5	7	2.8	3.8	1.0
		6				
A	St. Malachy	3	7	2.0	3.9	1.9
		4	5	2.9	4.7	1.8
		5	8	2.9	4.4	1.5
		6				
A	St. Michael	3	4	1.7	3.8	2.1
		4	8	2.2	3.9	1.7
		5	8	3.5	4.9	1.4
		6	8	4.7	6.3	1.6
A	San Miguel	3	9	1.8	3.3	1.5
		4	8	3.3	4.1	0.8
		5	6	3.4	4.7	1.3
		6	7	4.4	4.7	0.3
B	Assumption	3	6	1.6	3.7	2.1
		4	8	2.5	4.4	1.9
		5	8	3.5	5.2	1.7
		6	7	4.0	5.4	1.4
B	Dolores Mission	3	6	1.9	3.0	1.1
		4	7	2.4	3.9	1.5
		5	6	3.5	4.3	0.8
		6	7	4.1	4.5	0.4

Table 99 — Continued

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	N	PRE G.E.	POST G.E.	GAIN
B	Immaculate Conception	3	8	2.0	3.7	1.7
		4	7	2.4	4.1	1.7
		5	7	3.5	4.9	1.4
		6	6	5.2	6.6	1.4
B	Nativity	3	8	2.0	3.3	1.3
		4	8	3.0	4.1	1.1
		5	7	3.7	4.5	0.8
		6	7	3.6	4.9	1.3
B	Our Lady of Guadalupe	3	8	1.8	3.0	1.2
		4	8	2.8	4.1	1.3
		5	7	3.7	5.4	1.7
		6				
B	Our Lady Help of Christians	3	8	2.0	3.2	1.2
		4	7	3.0	4.1	1.1
		5	7	3.7	5.3	1.6
		6				
B	Our Lady of Loretto	3	9	2.3	3.4	1.1
		4	10	2.5	3.9	1.4
		5	8	3.6	5.0	1.4
		6				
B	Our Lady of Lourdes	3	8	2.0	3.3	1.3
		4	8	2.6	3.2	0.6
		5	8	3.4	4.3	0.9
		6	7	4.2	5.1	0.9
B	Our Lady of Soledad	3				
		4	8	2.2	3.8	1.6
		5	12	3.2	4.5	1.3
		6	11	4.9	5.4	0.5
B	Our Lady of Talpa	3				
		4	4	2.7	3.2	0.5
		5	9	3.5	4.5	1.0
		6				
B	Resurrection	3				
		4				
		5	7	3.4	5.5	2.1
		6	15	4.2	5.5	1.3

Table 99 — Continued

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	N	PRE G.E.	POST G.E.	GAIN
B	Sacred Heart	3	8	1.7	3.0	1.3
		4	4	2.6	4.3	1.7
		5	10	3.2	4.7	1.5
		6	8	4.6	5.1	0.5
B	St. Agnes	3	4	2.3	4.3	2.0
		4	5	3.1	4.3	1.2
		5	7	3.6	4.7	1.1
		6	6	4.6	5.9	1.3
B	St. Columbkille	3	6	1.6	2.8	1.2
		4	8	2.9	3.9	1.0
		5	6	3.5	4.3	0.8
		6	4	4.7	5.7	1.0
B	St. Mary	3	16	2.1	4.1	2.0
		4				
		5				
		6				
B	St. Odilia	3	7	1.9	3.0	1.1
		4	6	2.7	4.6	1.9
		5	8	3.3	4.9	1.6
		6	8	3.9	6.1	2.2
B	St. Raphael	3	4	2.0	3.3	1.3
		4	4	3.4	4.7	1.3
		5	3	3.4	5.5	2.1
		6	1	3.9	4.9	1.0
B	St. Thomas	3	6	3.1	3.7	0.6
		4	5	2.7	4.1	1.4
		5	8	4.5	5.0	0.5
		6	8	4.4	5.4	1.0
B	St. Turibius	3	8	1.7	4.2	2.5
		4				
		5	15	3.4	5.5	2.1
		6				
B	St. Vincent	3	8	1.4	3.2	1.8
		4	8	2.4	3.8	1.4
		5	7	3.8	5.6	1.8
		6	8	4.1	4.8	0.7

Table 99 — Continued

ZONE	SCHOOL	GRADE	N	PRE G.E.	POST G.E.	GAIN
B	San Antonio Padua	3	10	2.2	3.0	0.8
		4	10	2.9	4.2	1.3
		5	9	3.6	4.4	0.8
		6	7	5.0	6.7	1.7
B	Santa Isabel	3				
		4	16	3.0	4.6	1.6
		5	8	3.8	5.5	1.7
		6	8	4.1	6.0	1.9
B	Santa Teresita	3	5	2.0	4.3	1.7
		4	13	1.7	4.9	3.2
		5	10	4.1	6.2	2.1
		6	4	4.4	7.0	2.6
B	Holy Cross	7	35	5.4	5.6	0.2
		8	23	5.2	5.3	0.1
B	Our Lady Queen of Angeles	7	18	5.1	6.6	1.5
		8	24	5.2	6.3	1.1

Table 100 — Parent Responses

ITEM	PERCENTAGE YES	NO	N
Do you feel your child improved in arithmetic?	96	4	336
Does your child do more arithmetic at home?	82	18	334
Has your child's attitude toward school improved?	95	5	338
Did you receive information about the program?	89	11	336
Would you like to have this program continued?	99	1	339
Did you visit the program?	52	48	334

Note.—Table 100 is based on Form 022P. Maximum N = 344

Table 101 — Pupil Ratings

ITEM	MEDIAN SCORES Pretest	Posttest
How do you feel about:		
Working in your school?	3.6	3.3
Working in your PIE PALS' school?	3.3	2.9
Working with your classmates?	4.5	4.4
Working with your PIE PALS?	3.4	3.1
Doing your school work?	3.8	3.7
Taking field trips with your PIE PALS?	4.6	3.7
Riding on the bus with your class?	4.5	4.6
Riding on the bus with your PIE PALS?	3.6	3.3
Doing classwork with your class?	3.8	4.1
Doing classwork with your PIE PALS?	3.3	2.6
Eating lunch with your class?	4.6	4.5
Eating lunch with your PIE PALS?	3.7	3.2
Exchanging letters with a classmate?	3.9	4.0
Exchanging letters with your PIE PAL?	3.4	3.1
Playing games with your classmates?	4.7	4.8
Playing games with your PIE PALS?	3.7	3.3

Note.—Table 101 is based on Form 023R.

Pretest N = 193
Posttest N = 134

Table 102 — Teacher Ratings

ITEM	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
	Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Effective 5	
How effective is the PIE program in:						
Developing positive attitudes of your class toward other ethnic groups.	11	14	19	10	1	2.6
Assisting pupils in broadening and enriching their background.	2	4	14	22	14	3.9
Increasing your pupils' knowledge of subject matter.	1	6	19	22	8	3.6
Developing positive attitudes of your class toward themselves.	5	7	14	25	4	3.6
Helping you develop positive attitudes toward yourself.	7	3	19	19	6	3.3
Making you more aware of the problems of other groups.	10	10	17	8	11	3.0

Note.—Table 102 is based on Form 023T. N = 56

Table 103 — Parent Advisory Group Ratings

ITEM	FREQUENCY			MEDIAN
Extent or degree to which:	Little 1	Somewhat 2	Much 3	
Meetings were interesting	5	21	117	2.9
Topics were relevant and important	4	28	110	2.8
The group is accomplishing its purpose	19	48	70	2.5
The school values Advisory Group ideas and opinions	7	35	95	2.8
Understanding of specially-funded (Title I) programs in the school has been improved as a result of the meetings	9	31	92	2.8
Extent of help derived from:	Not Helpful 1	Helpful 2	Very Helpful 3	
Discussions in the group	1	82	48	2.3
Informal gatherings before or after meetings or at a break	9	66	48	2.3
Guest speakers	1	45	54	2.6
Field trips	5	35	74	2.7
Movies, filmstrips, tape recordings, etc.	6	26	55	2.7
Visiting schools	9	47	43	2.4

Note.—Table 103 is based on Form 023PAG. Maximum N responding = 143

Table 104 — Teacher Ratings of Inservice

ITEM	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
	Very Little 1	2	3	4	Very Much 5	
Extent of degree to which the program of inservice/staff development helped to improve						
Understanding of the effects of poverty on children	9	6	17	12	2	3.0
Intergroup and intercultural understanding	5	11	12	15	3	3.1
Teaching skills in specific instructional areas	6	3	12	18	8	3.6
Skills and use of paraprofessionals (e.g., education aides)	11	7	9	4	6	2.6
Skills and use of supportive personnel (e.g., counselors)	4	8	13	14	8	3.4
Skills in diagnosing individual student learning needs	12	9	7	14	4	2.8
Extent or degree to which the program helped to develop curricular innovations	8	5	7	20	6	3.6

Note.—Table 104 is based on Form 023T-1. Maximum N = 47

Table 105 — NPS Teacher Ratings of Counselor Services

ITEM	FREQUENCY					MEDIAN
	Very Ineffective 1	2	3	4	Very Effective 5	
How effective were Title I counseling services in helping you work with pupils						
To solve learning problems?	7	3	11	13	11	3.6
To cope with behavior problems?	6	2	13	13	8	3.5
To develop positive attitudes toward themselves?	5	2	17	11	9	3.4

Note.—Table 105 is based on Form 023T-1. N = 45

APPENDIX

LIST OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

LIST OF NONSTANDARDIZED INSTRUMENTS

GLOSSARY

LIST OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

1970 - 1971

NAME OF TEST	FORM	GRADE LEVEL
Elementary and Secondary		
Caldwell Preschool Inventory, Standardization Edition		Pre-K
Metropolitan Readiness Test	Form B	K
Cooperative Primary Reading Test	Form 12A	1
Cooperative Primary Reading Test	Form 23A	2
Stanford Reading Test	Primary II, Form X	3
Cooperative Primary Mathematics Test	Form 23A	3
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Level 2, Form R Level 2, Form Q	4, 5 6
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Levels 2, 3, 4; Forms Q, R	7, 8, 9
Nonpublic Schools		
Cooperative Primary Reading Test	Form 12B	2
Stanford Reading Test	Primary II, Forms W, X	3
Cooperative Primary Mathematics Test	Form 23A	3
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills - Reading, Language, and Arithmetic	Level 2, Form R	4, 5, 6
Special Education		
Metropolitan Readiness Test	Form B	K, 1
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	Form B	K-6
California Achievement Test	Lower Primary, Form W Upper Primary, Form W Elementary, Form W	K-6

LOS ANGELES CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION AT EMERSON MANOR

NON-STANDARDIZED FORMS AND INSTRUMENTS

COMPONENT	FORM NO.	TITLE	NEED	DISTRIBUTION	DUE DATE
	000A	Administrative Evaluation of Specially Funded Programs			4-22-71
	000A-1	Administrative Evaluation of Supportive Services			4-1-71
	000S	SFP Teacher and Consultant Eval.			4-22-71
	000SA	Teacher Rating of Aides			4-22-71
	000T	Regular Classroom Teacher Evaluation			4-22-71
	000T-1	Teacher Questionnaire			4-1-71
001	001SFT	Reading Resources Provided by Specially Funded Teachers			
	001IS	Report of Reading Instructional Systems for ESEA Title I Schools Data Collection Form			
	001T	Classroom Report of Reading Instructional Systems in ESEA Title I Schools			
002					
003	003P	Parent Questionnaire			
	003SPT	ESL/Bilingual Structured Placement Test - H200 Materials			
	003T	Regular Classroom Teacher Evaluation			4-22-71
005	005P	Parent Questionnaire			
	005R	Caldwell Preschool Inventory Roster 1970-71			10-14-70, 5-
	005SP	Monthly Report of Parent or Guardian Participation			after close of each school mon
007	007	Teacher Statement of Needs: Interim Evaluation (for Continuation Grant Application Information)			2-19-71
	007P	Parent Questionnaire			
	007PAC	Policy Advisory Committee Questionnaire			4-22-71
008	008A	Administrative Evaluation			1-15-71
	008P	Parent Questionnaire			1-13-71
	008R	Pupil Roster			
	008	Stick Figure Pupil Rating Scale			
	008T	Teacher Rating Scale			
	008T-1	Teacher Evaluation			
009					
010	010A	Principal Questionnaire - SCAC			4-1-71
	010B	School-Community Advisory Council Questionnaire			4-30-71
	010CH	SCAC Chairman Questionnaire			4-30-71
	010P	Parent Questionnaire			
011	011IP	Inservice Questionnaire			Each mtg. or se

LOS ANGELES CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION AT EMERSON MANOR

NON-STANDARDIZED FORMS AND INSTRUMENTS

COMPONENT	FORM NO.	TITLE	NEED	DISTRIBUTION	DUE DATE
012	012PSS-1	Pupil Progress Information - I			
	012PSS-2	Pupil Progress Information - II			
021	021P	Parent Questionnaire			
022	022P	Parent Questionnaire			
023	023R	Attitude Rating Scale			
	101A	Pupil Roster			
	101B	Principal's Statement on ESEA Testing Standards			
	101C	Teacher Numbers			
	101D	Suggestions of Desirable Administrative Skills for Compensatory Education Coordinators (CECs)			
	101E	Rating of Compensatory Education Coordinator			
	101F	Rating of Prescriptive Teaching			
	101G	SAC Program Evaluation			
	101H	Pupil Questionnaire			
	102A	Parent Questionnaire			
	102B	Parent Questionnaire (Spanish)			
	102C	Parent Involvement Questionnaire			
	102D	Parent Involvement Questionnaire			
	102E	Parent Involvement Questionnaire (Spanish)			
		QMOC			
	103A	Tally Record of Counseling Activities			
	103B	Counseling Profile			
	103C	Counseling Profile			
	104A	Questionnaire for Planning Workshop Participant			
	105A	Intergroup Measure of Concepts (IMOC)			

GLOSSARY

Analysis of Covariance: a statistical method used in comparing gains of groups initially different in size and level of achievement. (In lay terms, the procedure equalizes a starting point.)

Auxiliary Services: see Components.

Average Ability: (Secondary schools.) A. Normal average = 85 IQ - 115 IQ. B. Disadvantaged pupils, on the basis of depressed IQ's = 70 IQ - 100 IQ. C. Secondary SAC students (see SAC) are also selected on the basis of teacher recommendation.

Compensatory Education Coordinator (CEC): certificated personnel, selected by a screening process to act as SAC administrators in individual SAC schools (see SAC). The coordinator must be of the same ethnicity as the majority ethnic group of the school.

Components

Auxiliary Services Components: Counseling, Health Services, and Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) -- activities mandated by State Guidelines for all Title I pupils, according to their diagnosed need.

Instructional Components: for the elementary level, activities in reading, mathematics, English as a Second Language (ESL), kindergarten, pre-kindergarten, and Follow Through; for the secondary level, the reading and mathematics core program.

Supportive Services: the auxiliary services, as outlined above, plus Intergroup Relations, Parent Involvement, and Staff Development -- activities mandated by State Guidelines as support for the academic or instructional components.

Education Aide III: an aide for the teacher, working full time in the classroom. The aide must have at least a high school education, or equivalent, and may be in a restricted (living within local school area) or unrestricted (not limited to working only in the school area where the aide lives) classification.

ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 89-10 of the United States Congress), providing in Title I for compensatory education aid to schools in target (disadvantaged) areas.

Instructional Components: see Components.

Intergroup Relations Activities: planned, regular ongoing activities, such as the Program for Interschool Enrichment (PIE), which involve ESEA pupils and non-ESEA pupils of other schools (generally of a different ethnic and socio-economic background).

Matched Scores: scores where the same pupils took the test at the start of the instructional period (pretest) and at the end of the period (posttest). Growth of the same individual is being measured.

Mean: the average; in testing, the total of all scores added together and divided by the number of pupils taking the test.

Median: the mid point; an equal number of scores or ratings are above and below this point.

NPS: nonpublic schools.

PIE: Program for Interschool Enrichment. (See Intergroup Relations Activities.)

SAC - Student Achievement Center: local name for ESEA Title I program in secondary schools, grades 7-10. Students are selected for the program on the basis of being average underachievers (that is, two or more years below grade level).

Saturated Program: as in the elementary programs, Title I activities planned to affect all pupils in the school.

Significant at .01 and .05 levels: the probabilities of these results being due only to chance are, respectively, 1 in 100 and 5 in 100.

Standardized Test: a test which samples concepts and skills typically attained by pupils at a certain level. Its norms -- grade equivalents (GE), percentiles, etc. -- are developed by administering the test to samples of pupils considered to be representative of all kinds of pupils across the country; and its procedures, materials, and scoring are fixed so that the same test can be given at different times and places.

Supportive Services: see Components.

Teacher, Secondary (SAC): a successful, certificated teacher, in the second or third year with the District (probationary II or III) or having tenure. Special training has been received in the SAC subject area. (See SAC.)

Workshops: Regular, planned, preservice or inservice sessions for specific personnel to improve skills in a specific subject or area of learning.

Zone: in the 1969-70 school year, the Los Angeles City Schools were divided into four geographic zones, each headed by a Zone Superintendent. (Zones A and B contained the schools involved in ESEA Title I programs.) In the 1970-71 year, zones are being replaced by 12 administrative areas, of which eight have Title I schools.